

"Mr. Speaker, this achievement by a team representing one of our fine Dallas high schools is another indication of the fine record of Dallas County. It is natural for Dallas to lead. Our people have always prided themselves on getting things done and as a result we have one of the greatest metropolitan areas of the Nation. Our achievements in industry, retailing, education, and cultural activities are a constant wonder to people everywhere. It always gives me great satisfaction to announce the achievements of Dallas people and to call attention to the fact that our progress as a community, in every field, is done through the efforts of our own people.

"That success in scholastic achievement is not confined to one Dallas high school was stressed by Rev. Father Herlong, of Jesuit, talking of the friendly rivalry between the various school debate teams. He said the Dallas students have a close bond with one another. He told how this was demonstrated last year in an intercity debate in which Bryan Adams, a public high school, and Jesuit competed. Jesuit was declared the winner and when the announcement was made, the whole Bryan Adams team stood up and cheered. Father Herlong paid tribute to Bryan Adams as well as Garland High School and said they are both on a par with Jesuit and he feels that in last week's tournament they would have done as well and perhaps even better than Jesuit.

"Incidentally, on a personal note, Father Herlong is a distant cousin of our colleague, Congressman SID HERLONG, of Florida."

In a continuing effort to arouse a sense of rededication to basic American principles, I included in the RECORD some remarks on

a truth too often overlooked in the Declaration of Independence:

**"HAPPINESS MUST BE EARNED"**

"(Extension of remarks of Hon. BRUCE ALGER, of Texas, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, February 21, 1963)

"Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following copy from the advertisement of the Warner & Swasey Co., in the February 25 issue of U.S. News & World Report, should be read by all freedom-loving Americans. It reminds us that no government can guarantee happiness, only the right to seek happiness. Too many of our people today are becoming imbued with the idea that the guarantee of happiness is a right, forgetting the happiness must be bred within the individual and cannot be superimposed by any outside force. Any attempt by a government to give to its people some kind of happiness means a subsequent loss of freedom, and without freedom no man can be truly happy.

"The article follows:

"*'Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness*

*'When you read the Declaration of Independence (and everyone of us should) read it all. Too many Americans think it guarantees them life, liberty, and happiness. Not at all—only the pursuit of happiness.*

*'No one but a selfish child thinks he has the right to happiness. Adults know it has to be deserved, earned—and the only way to earn it is to contribute more to the world than you take.*

*'If you are a worker, you produce enough to pay your wage plus enough to pay for the machine, without which you would have no job.*

*'If you're a businessman, you produce enough to pay your workman a fair wage, enough for an incentive return to your stockholders whose savings built the company, and enough for your share of necessary taxes to protect your country.*

*'If you're a politician you work first for the good of your country, not your party or yourself.*

*'That is the honest way to happiness as every intelligent adult knows. Anything seized in any other way is grasping greed, of which any self-respecting American should be ashamed.*

*'Is it useless to hope for that kind of Americanism? We don't think so.'*

These excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are just a sampling of the week's work of a Member of Congress. In addition to debate on the floor, most of my time this week was spent in committee where we continued the hearings on the President's tax proposals and on his request for an extension of the increase in the debt ceiling.

Witness after witness, under my questioning and that of my Republican colleagues on the committee, have been forced to admit the proposals of the President, if enacted into law, will retard, not accelerate our economy. I continued to hammer home the fact that while tax cuts are necessary and justified, they will be completely meaningless unless a substantial cut is made in Federal spending. Without reduced spending a \$10-to-\$20 billion tax cut will cause inflationary pressures which will mean higher prices, lower dividends on investments and savings, higher insurance premiums, and in the end the great majority of our people will have less money to spend, and business growth will be hindered, not helped.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 6, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*I Chronicles 29: 5: Who then is willing to consecrate his service this day unto the Lord?*

O Thou gracious Benefactor, who alone can supply our temporal needs and satisfy our eternal longings, help us to walk the way of life with a determination of courage which nothing can daunt and a splendor of faith which can never be eclipsed by doubt or despair.

May the mind and heart of our President, our Speaker, and all the Members of Congress be strengthened and sustained by lofty principles and purposes as they seek, in unity of spirit, to discharge faithfully the arduous tasks of their high vocation.

Grant that this Lenten season may not only be a time of commemoration but of consecration when we shall commit ourselves unreservedly to the doing of Thy will and the building of a finer social order.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 4, 1963, was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that

the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 13. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land situated in the State of Arkansas to the city of Fayetteville, Ark.; and

S. 345. An act to provide for the approval of a payment in lieu of taxes to be made for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, by the Hawaii Housing Authority to the city and county of Honolulu.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to title 16, United States Code, section 513, had appointed Mr. AIKEN to be a member of the National Forest Reservation Commission to fill an existing vacancy.

The message also announced that Mr. ROBERTSON, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, pursuant to section 712(a) of Public Law 774, 81st Congress, appointed Mr. TOWER a member of the Joint Committee on Defense Production to fill an existing vacancy.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the U.S. Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 63-8.

### HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION ENROLLED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that

that committee had, on March 5, 1963, examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 284. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Monday, March 4, 1963, he did on March 5, 1963, sign the following enrolled joint resolution of the House:

H.J. Res. 284. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

### DISSEMINATION OF OBSCENE MATTER THROUGH THE MAILS

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious problems existing in our Nation today is the harm that is caused to our people, especially the youth of our country, through the dissemination of obscene literature and other degrading publications and pornographic material through the mails.

The Post Office Department has been hampered in the efforts it has made to ban such material from the mails by reason of the lack of adequate statutory authority.

Our church, patriotic, and civic organizations throughout the country are making a splendid effort to curb the dissemination of obscene matter through the mails. Unless adequate statutory authority exists, however, for the Post Office Department to punish those engaged in distributing immoral and degrading matter the problem will continue to exist.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which, if enacted, will do much to halt the spread of obscene matter. My measure prescribes what I believe to be adequate penalties for those who would engage in the distribution of material which has such an adverse effect on the moral health of our Nation.

My bill provides that anyone who places in the mails a lewd, lascivious, or degrading article, publication, or picture of any kind shall be subject to a fine for the first offense up to \$5,000 and imprisonment up to 5 years, or both. For a second offense a person would be liable to a fine of \$10,000 and imprisonment from 5 to 10 years, or both.

I feel that the Congress has no greater duty than to provide adequate safeguards against the distribution of obscene matter in the mails, and it is my sincere hope that my colleagues in the House will support the enactment of my measure.

#### THE SOVIET BUILDUP IN CUBA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, during the Soviet buildup in Cuba last year, allied merchant ships indirectly aided the Communist bloc by chartering their hulls for nonmilitary cargoes, thus freeing the limited Communist merchant fleet for military shipments to Cuba. Along with several other Members of Congress who realized this situation, I advocated that U.S. ports be closed to flagships of nations engaged in hauling goods of any kind to Cuba.

Little has been done by the U.S. Government since that time to thwart allied shipping to Cuba. The only real change in the situation has been the shifting of public attention from allied shipping to Cuba to several other aspects of the Cuban problem—namely, such matters as the debate over whether Communist arms in Cuba are offensive or defensive in nature.

However, I am pleased to see the recent reports that bear out my suggestions that all U.S. ports be closed to flagships calling in Cuba. Last week, wire service reports were carried stating that the State Department is holding further talks with nations engaged in this commerce—namely, Great Britain, Japan, Greece, Lebanon, Italy, and Nor-

way. As you can see, these nations are among our closest allies, yet they continue their shipping for our avowed Communist enemies.

Life magazine has now endorsed the suggestion that U.S. ports be closed in this week's issue, pointing out that such a closure would place severe economic restrictions on Castro, yet not constitute an act of war. I urge that this Government intensify its efforts to cut off allied shipping, and increase our efforts by closing U.S. ports to the flag of any nation which allows its ships to trade with Cuba.

#### SERVICES OF LEWIS DESCHLER, PARLIAMENTARIAN

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in extending congratulations to Lew Deschler as he passes the 35-year landmark of superb service as Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives.

As he always proves helpful to Members in House proceedings, so has his counsel been my guide rail on numerous occasions. And his assistance and advice are always given willingly, generously, and courteously.

Mr. Deschler's work is of a demanding nature, and his efficiency in resolving complex problems of parliamentary procedure quickly convinces one that here is a man who really knows his job. Such a facility for coping with congressional complexities can be the product only of vast wisdom and long experience.

In a large sense, Lew can be likened unto a referee who officiates in one of the greatest of all games, the vital game of legislation. And we who are players in that game cannot help but feel surer of foot and more certain of our moves because of the proven ability of the man who calls the rules on the plays.

It gives me great pleasure then, on this occasion, to express to Lew my great appreciation for the many kindnesses and courtesies he has extended me.

And I am certainly happy to lend my voice to those who, with sure sincerity and good cause, acclaim Lew Deschler as a "parliamentarian's parliamentarian."

#### CUBA AS A BASE FOR SUBVERSION

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on February 6, 1963, at 5 p.m., the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Robert S. McNamara, held a so-called press conference in the State Department Auditorium, and it is my

understanding it was broadcast throughout the Nation by television and radio.

He was asked this question at that interview:

Mr. Secretary, could you comment on the possibilities that Cuba is being used as a training base for subversion in other Latin American countries.

Secretary McNAMARA. I have no evidence that Cuba is being used as a base for subversion directed against other Latin American countries.

Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and its Inter-American Subcommittee has been holding hearings on the situation with respect to Cuba and the Central and South American area. Mr. McCone, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, appeared before the committee on February 19, 1963. Let me quote one paragraph from his testimony:

At least 1,000 to 1,500 persons came to Cuba during 1962, from all the other Latin American countries with the possible exception of Uruguay, to receive ideological indoctrination or guerrilla warfare training or both. More have gone in 1963 despite the limited facilities for reaching Cuba at present.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to those who administer the affairs of this Government, I ask whether the left hand knows what the right hand is doing?

#### COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 228 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1963, the expenses of conducting the investigations and studies authorized by H. Res. 179, Eighty-eighth Congress, by the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$530,000 for the Eighty-eighth Congress, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of accountants, experts, investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 5, strike out "\$530,000" and insert "\$180,000".

Line 13, insert the following new paragraph:

"Sec. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee and the full Committee on House Administration have agreed to



give the Banking and Currency Committee the amount of \$180,000. This was done after very careful consideration and justification of the need for this minimum appropriation.

Our committee feels that if the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee finds he does not have sufficient funds later on, he can come back and request an additional appropriation if he can justify it. We assure him that our committee will give him a prompt hearing on any such request.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. As one of the members of the subcommittee, I just want to say I think what the gentleman has said is obviously an invitation to come back, and I want to say that the amount with reference to this committee has escalated from \$5,000, for 2 years in the last Congress, to where we have given them \$180,000 for 1 year and if the chairman of the committee accepts the invitation of the gentleman from Maryland, he had better be prepared to do a lot of justifying.

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is just what I said. If it is justified, the committee would consider it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], for the purpose of making a statement.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I invite the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that one private organization, the Commission on Money and Credit, recently completed a study of the Nation's money and credit system. This commission spent 3 years at the task and spent almost \$2 million of private money. When a private organization spends \$2 million to make a study of matters needing legislation by the Congress, it shows there is a public need and demand for information about problems which are the responsibility of Congress.

The need is there. As this commission report points out, there has been no overall study of our money and credit system since the study of the Aldrich commission, made more than 50 years ago.

The Commission on Money and Credit issued a report which makes at least 85 major recommendations for changes in the laws affecting the Nation's financial institutions, public and private. If the subject matter of these recommendations is important enough to call for the expenditure of \$2 million of private money, then they are important enough for the Congress to spend a few thousand dollars to study this matter, so that it can legislate intelligently.

Obviously, our committee cannot simply accept or reject these recommendations without itself looking into the factual situations which underlie them. In fact, I am not at all sure that the Commission on Money and Credit actually gathered any new facts. It seems to me that their scholars mostly did think pieces, and the recommendations were based on these. For example, I asked Mr. Frazar Wilde, the chairman

of the Commission on Money and Credit, a question along these lines:

Did you consider the significance of the decreasing number of commercial banks in the country over the past 40 years? During these years, the period of greatest growth in our history, the number of commercial banks has gone down from 31,000 to 13,500. Did your commission go into that to determine why the number of commercial banks is going down?

Mr. Wilde answered "No," that the commission did not examine into this question.

Now, that is a very important question, and it should be gone into; we should find out the reason for this trend. We need a good banking system. We need a profitable banking system. We need commercial banks in time of peace and in time of war. We cannot do without them.

There are many questions in the jurisdiction of our committee that should be gone into, that have not been gone into in the last 50 years.

Obviously it is impossible even for this one task to be performed without funds. If we have the funds I would expect to obtain the help of some of the college professors and other experts. I would expect to use some of the same professors who worked for the Commission on Money and Credit; some of them have complained to me that they were not privileged to obtain some of the facts they needed. That is the reason why in our budget we have stated that we will use people on a contractual basis, college professors, for example, where we can get them only for 6 weeks, 3 months, or for a year. The money, if appropriated, will be prudently spent, of course.

Our studies and investigations will not be for the purpose of trying to embarrass any political party, any person, or any group of financial institutions. It will be for the purpose of making factual studies.

I respectfully suggest that the amount of funds which the Committee on House Administration approved is low. The committee has recognized, however, that this amount is just for 10 months, and if we can make a showing at the end of that time that we need more money, then we can come back to that committee and ask for more money. Any money we get we expect to use in the most careful possible way, and for the public interest. If we do not use it all, we will, of course, turn it back.

May I say also that our committee has pending an extremely large volume of legislation, the reason being in part, I think, because it has been so long since we have made any study of our money and credit system and the component financial institutions.

I thank my colleague the gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that this is not construed

as an invitation for any committee to come back for more funds. They will have to justify any additional request, but if they can justify such a request, we will hear them while the House is in session.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of this subcommittee of the Committee on House Administration for the past 14 years and some months with the exception of a period of 2 or 3 months in the 83d Congress. A lot of committees have come before the committee in that length of time.

I have no quarrel with the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I want to see him have as much money as he needs, but I am telling him that if he is going to take every report that some committee downtown submits to this body, I do not care whether it costs \$2 million or \$20 million, there is not enough money in the contingency fund to finance it. For instance, many reports come to the Foreign Affairs Committee. There was the report of the Draper Committee, and I do not know how many others; but when we get a report we file it in file 13, the round one under the desk, and then proceed to have our own committee hearings and make the decision which is our responsibility to make.

You can have a hearing about money and credit from here on out. You can have a hearing about many phases of banking. There are endless hearings and investigations that could be had. We hear a lot about the spending of counterpart money by Members who go abroad, but I can point to you that there are at least half a dozen committees in this House who spend more—I know one last year that spent more than the total amount spent by all Members on foreign travel put together. I am not going to name names, but there are two committees that contract for employees. I was on the select committee of the Committee on House Administration to study these contracts last year, and there were two committees of this House who had—23 in one committee and 30 in another—people under contract for amounts varying from \$500 to \$10,000 supposedly to make studies and reports to the committee, and I will bet you not 1 of the 63 could justify their existence. One of them was the secretary of the NAACP. He was under private contract for \$10,000. I maintain that we should not have the secretary of any organization—White Citizens Committee, Grain Dealers of America, or any other organization—making a private investigation under his own steam, while being paid with Government funds.

The Committee on House Administration, Mr. Speaker, has never crippled any committee. The only reason I take this time is to say to the gentleman from Texas and all the rest, there has been a lot of criticism of some committees, there has been a lot of criticism of these people being hired under contract. All I said before and all I am saying now is that if you come in again before the first of next year, you had better have a lot of facts and figures to justify what

you are asking for, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN].

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the amount recommended by the Committee on House Administration for the Committee on Banking and Currency. I thought the first request was too large. I think they have arrived at a fair figure.

I would also like to inform the House that the chairman of the committee [Mr. PATMAN] and I have come to a fine agreement as far as staff is concerned. The gentleman from Texas has been very fair. Our present staff is 10, 2 to the minority and 8 to the majority; but of those 8, some of them serve us just the same as they do the majority. If he adds five more members to the staff, one would be for the minority and four for the majority. If he adds 10, 2 will be for us and 8 for the majority. I think a lot of them will be nonpartisan and we can all use them. The thing has worked out very well, due to the fine cooperation of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK].

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my deep personal appreciation to the chairman of the full Committee on House Administration, Mr. BURLESON, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. FRIEDEL, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, and my colleagues, both majority and minority, on the committee for the very sincere and hard work they have done and for their high degree of fairness on all the difficult questions raised during the thorough considerations for the appropriations for the operation and work of the committees of the House.

Our committee has worked hard and long on these appropriation resolutions. It has not been easy. There have been honest differences of opinion, but they have been resolved as sensible people should resolve differences of opinion and without sacrificing sound principles.

I want to associate myself with the comments of my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] and my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] as to the question of justification for any additional appropriations. It has seemed to me, Mr. Speaker, there has arisen a misunderstanding of the reasons for making these 1-year appropriations.

When I first suggested to our chairman, Mr. BURLESON, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the idea of making these appropriations for 1 year, and we agreed on that, my purpose was to give the Committee on House Administration an opportunity, as has been said, to review the expenditures and the work done by the various committees each year and to thus establish better control over these expenditures. This was not intended, Mr. Speaker, as an invita-

tion to come back to the House Committee on Administration for more funds; neither was it our intention to permit chairmen of committees to develop studies which would take extensive time and money for staff, and then come to our committee later and say, we have only partially completed our investigation and we will need additional funds to complete our unfinished work.

Mr. Speaker, it was my own personal intention in making the suggestion to the chairman of our Committee on House Administration, that all the committee chairmen of the House be cautioned to spend the money allocated to them with prudence and responsibility so that the work and program they intended to do can be fully completed within the appropriation allotted for this year of the Congress. Also, Mr. Speaker, that if it should become necessary for any committee chairman to request additional funds for any purpose whatsoever, that the chairman of such committee would be on notice and fully aware of the need to completely justify and document any such subsequent request for any additional funds.

Mr. Speaker, on February 27, when we here on this floor approved some 20 committee appropriations, both the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, and as I recall, the majority leader of the House of Representatives—these two distinguished gentlemen—called attention to the fact that the majority party in the House does have the full responsibility for the regulation and supervision of committee policies and procedures and that the majority party both recognizes and will exercise this responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, if anyone doubts that those statements were made he can refer to pages 3053, 3054, and 3055 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 1963, and read again these flat statements.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the majority will fully assume its proper responsibility and that its leadership will guide the studies and the investigations to be developed by all the committees of the House and their chairmen.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO EMPLOY TWO ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 225 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That effective February 1, 1963, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is authorized, until otherwise pro-

vided by law, to employ two additional employees at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202(c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXPENSES FOR STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS TO BE CONDUCTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 254, with committee amendments, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That, effective from January 3, 1963, the expenses of the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 103 by the Committee on Education and Labor, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$697,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$697,000" and insert "\$200,000".

Page 1, line 11, after "House" insert a period and strike out all that follows down through and including the period on page 2, line 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Of such amount \$25,000 shall be available for each of six subcommittees of the Committee on Education and Labor, and not to exceed \$50,000 shall be available to the Committee on Education and Labor. All amounts authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund by this resolution shall, in the case of each subcommittee, be paid on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of the subcommittee, cosigned by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration; in the case of the committee, such amount shall be paid on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration."

Page 2, line 17, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I desire recognition on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 1 hour.



Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution on the Education and Labor Committee. We are authorizing \$200,000 for a single year. We have restricted \$150,000 of that \$200,000 to be channeled through the subcommittee chairmen, six subcommittee chairmen. All vouchers presumably from this \$150,000 given to the subcommittee chairmen must be approved in advance by the subcommittee chairmen.

Mr. Speaker, there is an additional \$50,000, making the total \$200,000, which will be available to the full committee and to the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that I think the end effect of what we are doing will be to disable completely the minority on the Committee on Education and Labor. We are at this point prepared, as a minority, to hire expert professional help in the field of education and in the field of labor. We would like to hire them. Hearings have been going on in both these fields for some time. We need that professional help.

The chairman is going to have, with this \$200,000 that is authorized here, \$50,000 with which presumably he could meet the needs of the minority and also take care of all of his own committee expenses; reporting services, stenographic, telephone bills, and that type of thing.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should understand what we are doing. I think there have been abuses, and we had a bipartisan front in the House Administration Committee to try to control the expenditure of these funds. But as a practical matter the passage of this resolution in its present form will give nothing to the minority. Perhaps I am premature. We intend to request the chairman to grant the minority some help, and perhaps he will accede to that request. But I think in view of past experience that it is a very highly optimistic view—to presume that he may accede to that request, especially under present circumstances. I think we are going to be back here very shortly with further requests to try to protect the minority.

I want to pay tribute to the members of the majority party on the House Administration Committee in this respect. There was expressed throughout these hearings a willingness and a desire and an intention to protect the minority, to give them an opportunity to hire the necessary professional help which we need. Unfortunately, it was not put into precise language in this resolution to give us the guarantee that we need.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I find myself in agreement with much that the gentleman is saying. I think the gentleman will agree that in the last 24 hours an unproductive but reasonable solution or agreement had been reached. I think the gentleman will find that most members of the majority on the Committee on Education

and Labor are anxious that the minority have the staff which we acknowledge it needs, in particular an education and a labor expert; that if following the adoption of this resolution there is constructive action taken we can reach an agreement rather quickly and bring about a more equitable solution for everyone.

We have been cut, in my judgment, by this resolution, not only to the bone but into the bone. It is an unhappy set of circumstances which brings this about. Once the resolution is adopted, however, I am certain we can reach an agreement and I, for one, will work with the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] and the ranking member, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], to bring this about.

Mr. GOODELL. May I express appreciation for that assurance, but I want to emphasize that this is a very immediate need and a very critical need on the part of the minority on the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. We recognize that.

Mr. GOODELL. We cannot wait a month or 2 months to see how unsatisfactory our situation is because of the refusal to recognize minority rights in our committee. We are well along with hearings in the field of education, the Youth Conservation Corps, and other fields. Two months have passed by without our having the professional help we need. We hope in some way we can provide a means to meet this immediate need in a fair and bipartisan way.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on this resolution. However, I hear that there is a possibility that a motion to recommit will be made to add \$35,000 for the minority.

I should like to point out that this committee, the same as every other committee in the House, has a provision in the reorganization act for 10 staff members. I understand from the testimony adduced from the minority itself that two of these men are assigned to the minority. Of this money, \$150,000 is assigned to the subcommittees. I would think from what I have heard from both sides that the minority will get fair and equitable treatment in the subcommittees.

I want to make another point. I have heard a lot of conversation about the tremendous amount of work this committee does, and I am sure it does, and how they have been cut out of funds. Last year the Committee on Foreign Affairs handled the foreign aid bill, which started out with \$4 billion, the Peace Corps bill, the disarmament bill, and a half a dozen others of great importance, with exactly one-third the amount of money the House Committee on Education and Labor had to spend last year.

We have a professional staff on that committee. If somebody said, "Here is a million dollars if you can tell me the politics of three of them or whether they are of the majority or minority," I could not accept the money because I do not know. Most of them have been there

from the time the Republicans controlled this House, and they have stayed on. That committee turns out a lot of work, yet nobody knows who the minority members are. They are staff members and they do the job when they are asked to do it. This might be the solution for the Education and Labor Committee.

We have heard a lot of testimony about how they are asking too much money for both sides. We have assured them if they are really being crippled they can come in and get a further hearing before our committee. But we had testimony from the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM], among others—and I hope he does not mind my mentioning his name—that there are many employees of this committee that he had never seen or knew where they were working, if they were working at all, and there were a great number of people under private contract. The select subcommittee of which I was chairman looked into these private contracts and found that nobody on this committee except the chairman had any knowledge of these employees whatsoever. This is an attempt on the part of the House to sort of regulate this so that the employees, wherever—I am sorry—whoever they may be, will be here in Washington working for the committee and not drawing checks when they are off some place in some other part of the country.

There has been talk about abuses in connection with the appointment of staff members. I expect this committee was pretty high on the list of those who abuse it. We read a lot of news in the papers about a shortage of college professors. There were so many under contract around here in these committees last year, that I can understand that is why we have this shortage. That is why we have this rule not to hire anybody under contract unless the House Administration Committee takes a look at the contract. We want them to get back to the university and get back to teaching.

I do not think that will be an entirely unwholesome proposition when it finally works out. I just want to point out in conclusion that every other committee in the House has refrained from having stipulated how much money the minority would get, and if you do it for this committee by a motion to recommit or otherwise, you can expect to destroy the nonpartisan staffs of a great many committees that the Members on both sides would not like to see destroyed—and I can mention the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services as two of them.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRIFFIN. What do you propose to do about the minority staff problem on the Committee on Education and Labor?

Mr. HAYS. I propose that you settle it in your committee and, if there is a real abuse, I think you can get enough of the people on our side to vote with you to do something about it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Under the resolution you have reported only \$50,000 is available to the chairman.

Mr. HAYS. That is right. The chairman now has 10 employees of which you say you have 2.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Do you think the chairman is going to give any of that \$50,000 for minority staffing?

Mr. HAYS. I expect that he will not.

Mr. GRIFFIN. All right, then.

Mr. HAYS. But I do not think he can hire very many people with it and still pay travel and phone bills either so your ratio is not going to be too bad.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I believe I am correct in saying that the \$50,000 referred to by the gentleman from Michigan is available not to the chairman but to the committee, and if the gentleman on the other side of the aisle wishes to discuss the matter not only with the chairman but with the entire membership of the committee, that is the proper place to do it. Unfortunately, the chairman of the committee is ill today with influenza and cannot be here.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman will find his description of the uncooperative spirit of the chairman with respect to the \$50,000 is quite wrong. If he wants to bring this forward and have a discussion, I think as soon as the chairman is on his feet and is able to be here, he will find that he will be able to do so and I am sure it will be in the very near future.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], the ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. With respect to the allocation of funds, I would like to point out to the House that on page 2 of the resolution on lines 2 through 5, there is this language: "of such amount \$25,000 shall be available for each of the six subcommittees of the Committee on Education and Labor and not to exceed \$50,000 shall be available to the Committee on Education and Labor."

Now this is the language of the resolution and it is the language of the Reorganization Act. The moneys are within the control of the majority of the committee. All we are trying to indicate, and at least what I am trying to indicate, is the assurance that the majority will make an effort to see that justice is done.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I appreciate the gentleman's assurances. I only wish I had something more substantial from the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to remind my colleagues that 8 weeks ago today this Congress convened. I, for one, feel it is high time that the Committee on Education and Labor received funds so it can operate properly. I should also like to point out that it is almost 3 months ago, on December 14, to be exact, that I had a discussion with the chairman of the full committee with respect to funds for the minority staff. We have had a very serious problem over the last 2 years, with respect to the necessity for more adequate staffing. Since that time, unfortunately, I have had until very recently no discussion with the chairman of the full committee with respect to the staff. Nor have I had any answers to my letters since December requesting information as to his position on this question. Finally, on February 28, I did receive a brief memo which stated his position, and I quote:

This is a firm commitment that out of the present budget, \$110,000 will be allotted to the minority to use as they see fit.

Plus two minority staff personnel, Mr. Richard T. Burrell and Mrs. Beverly Pearson, will be on the standing committee at all times.

I should like to correct an observation made by the gentleman from Ohio with respect to what the minority presently has on the standing committee. We have only one member on the standing committee at this time. We hope that the firm commitment from the chairman will insure that we will have two members on that committee hereafter.

I do not know whether this proposed cutting of funds will make him change his mind about what he has described as a firm commitment. I did receive from the clerk of the full committee yesterday a telephone notice, and I quote:

The chairman can give no commitments to the minority until he finds out how much he is getting.

In other words, the firm commitment which I got last week is apparently worth nothing because of the reduced amount which is to be made available to the committee.

I consider it essential that the minority have an adequate amount. I would like to ask the chairman of the House Administration Subcommittee what perhaps we might anticipate, in his view, as a reasonable amount? A total of \$200,000 is to be made available, of which \$50,000 is to be made available to the committee itself.

I notice that the request for funds for the committee's operation was \$25,000 for the next 2-year period. This would seem to mean that \$12,500 a year would be sufficient for the full committee. Might not the House Administration seem to indicate that the reduction in funds should be directed primarily at the so-called investigative task force, for which \$202,000 was requested in the next 2-year period?

I hope we can anticipate that the minority can get a substantial amount of

that \$50,000. We need some reassurance from the chairman, or the committee itself, that we are entitled to it. We need some indication with respect to a percentage of the total, or the specific number of employees that we can have. I for one am very much disturbed about the uncertainty of things.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The language of the resolution leaves the question not up to the Committee on House Administration but to the Committee on Education and Labor. I again would like to assure the gentleman and the minority that a majority of the majority side is anxious to resolve this question and to do it within a matter of as few days as possible. The gentleman knows something of the tentative agreement which we have. We can do this within a matter of days.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I can only say that if the committee has that power, I wish they had reached a firm agreement before now, and thus avoiding the necessity of coming here and publicly airing our problems.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. There can be no doubt the power exists.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. It is obvious, of course, to all who have listened to this discussion that there have been difficult problems in connection with this particular resolution. I think it is worthy of note that in connection with previous similar resolutions accommodations that were fairly satisfactory were arrived at.

I think it is fair to say that as of today no such accommodation has been arrived at with respect to this resolution as it passed the Committee on Education and Labor. In view of that fact, there has been a difference of opinion on the minority side as to what best ought to be done about it, and I do not know what ultimately might be done. But I do want to say that with the assurances that have been given to us, first of all the other day when we had some general discussion involving this matter of minority rights and responsibilities in connection with committee staffs, I thought very fair statements were made by the leaders on the majority side of the aisle.

I certainly feel today there have been assurances given that cannot be put into effect immediately, but assurances given by responsible members not only of the House Administration Committee but of the Committee on Education and Labor, that I am sure were meant in good faith, in all sincerity, by people of integrity; and I would certainly express the hope that if this resolution goes through as it has been reported, that very, very soon some accommodation could be reached that would protect what I feel are the essential rights of the minority on this very important committee.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].



Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, apropos of what the gentleman from Indiana has said, I think the gentleman will agree with me that under the resolution pending, and under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, this is a matter which has always been left to the legislative committees.

I think the gentleman would further agree that in a matter of this kind, if we want to depart from the objectives of the Reorganization Act we ought to do it by amending the rules and not by starting a piecemeal departure, committee by committee. If we do anything else, we are going to get ourselves in the position of amending the rules of the House piecemeal in the wrong forum, at the wrong time, and under the wrong circumstances.

With respect to what the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey has said, may I say that this very committee in previous years, by a majority vote of the committee, under the control of this side of the House, vetoed the action of a previous chairman relating to the appointment of a staff member. That power rests in the committee, and if the committee in its wisdom cannot work out its problems, it would seem to me that the gentleman and others interested in this matter would approach the matter of amending the rules of the House in such a manner as to provide for equal treatment of all committees.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend by remarks and include a statement I made to the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Committee on House Administration for the action it has taken. I can imagine it took a great deal of courage to do the things that it had to do. Simultaneously, I want to give my assurance, if any is needed, to the minority that I will work with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON]; the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT]; and the other members of the committee who are subcommittee chairmen, in trying to work this problem of money out to the complete satisfaction of the minority.

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with a committee which has jurisdiction over two of the most live subject matters of the day. Education is the foundation on which this country will continue to grow and be the powerful leader in the world it must be. If we do not give proper and adequate attention to that subject and adjust ourselves to the changing needs of education, then our structure of government is going to fall because of it.

Likewise, this committee deals with another most sensitive and important subject, that of labor, which, if it does not give proper, careful, studious attention to, the country's productive capacity

will suffer tremendously, and instead of growing, our standard of living will cease to grow at the rate we require.

So I say rather than have the two delicate, important, and sensitive subject matters lumped under one head, it is high time the House of Representatives recognize that the real problem here does not lie in the amount of money that comes to one particular member, whether he be chairman or not chairman, to do with as he pleases, to carry on studies that he wants for his own particular benefit, but that we amend the rules of this House by dissolving the present Committee on Education and Labor and establishing separate committees instead.

I hold a resolution which I intend to drop in the hopper, and on which I intend to ask for a hearing and consideration at the earliest possible time. These two major subject matters have to be separated, and a major Committee on Education, consisting of 25 members, and a major Committee on Labor, consisting of 25 members, be established under the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it is my opinion that if we will get down to business on this important matter then we can eliminate the great overlap that exists throughout this Government in the field of education.

Mr. Speaker, we come here annually and discuss the matter of Federal assistance to education and some are opposed to it, and say that they want no part of Federal aid to education. Listen, the Federal Government is saturated, it is pregnant with educational assistance. Each year we spawn something here in the field of Federal assistance to education about which few people know, and 2 or 3 years down the road we arrive at "Well, what have we done? We have not helped education, but we have helped a particular group or a particular institution."

Mr. Speaker, it is time we begin to study the fact that almost every agency of this Federal Government is conducting some form of educational program. Moreover, it is high time that we recognize the fact that while there might have been some justification for joining the areas of education and labor when the Reorganization Act was passed in 1946, there is no basis for continuing to study these vital subjects under one committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman has stated that this committee is a very important committee. It has two very important functions. I agree with the gentleman, but I would just like to call the attention of the House to the fact that the committee has always had these responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I think I know about what the Members of the House are alarmed at this time, and that is that

in the 83d Congress this committee received \$125,000. In the 84th Congress again it received \$125,000. In the 85th Congress it received \$125,000 for 2 years of its operations.

I think every Member of this Congress will agree that they did a good job during those 6 years. Yet in the 87th Congress this committee spent \$633,000.

Could the gentleman tell me what responsibilities this committee has that it did not have back in those years?

Mr. LANDRUM. Well, I will say to the gentleman from Florida that so far as I know there are no additional responsibilities, but maybe some additional activities have been undertaken.

Mr. HALEY. If the gentleman will yield further, I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. LANDRUM. I will say to the gentleman from Florida that in the statement I shall include with my remarks here this morning the gentleman will find not only the figures which the gentleman has given to the Members of the House, but the additional figures for the other two Congresses, together with the amounts which were returned for each Congress through the 86th, and stating that nothing was returned from the 87th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include at this point the statement which I delivered to the Committee on House Administration yesterday on this subject.

The statement referred to follows:

Mr. Chairman, the proposed budget of the House Committee on Education and Labor for the 88th Congress is outrageously high. Frankly after careful study of all the responsibilities devolving upon this committee I am compelled to state that the request for the sum of \$697,000 is an unconscionable affront to the Members of the House of Representatives and the U.S. taxpayers.

Specifically it is my considered judgment that the request for \$202,000 appropriation to support an investigative task force ought to be eliminated in its entirety. All information required by the committee on labor-management irregularities and federally supported education activities, can be, and is supplied by the various units set up in the Department of Labor for enforcing and policing labor-management laws. Likewise, the Office of the Commissioner of Education can do, and does do, an adequate job of keeping the committee informed on federally supported education activities.

A careful study of the activities of the investigative task force inaugurated in the 87th Congress will show that no benefits have accrued to the committee or to the Congress as a result of sums expended on such activities. This \$202,000 is a shrewdly calculated patronage grab. It ought to be deleted by this Committee on House Administration. The self-respect of each Member of Congress requires condemnation by the entire membership. Official records available to your committee support this contention.

I have also made a very careful study of the activities of the various subcommittees, six in number, for which specific sums of \$60,000 for each committee is requested. I can and do appreciate the responsibilities of a subcommittee and its chairmen to discharge the committee's obligations. I do not believe, however, that the obligation of any one of these subcommittees require such exorbitant sums of money. It is my belief that each of these subcommittees can operate effectively on no more than \$20,000 annual budget.

Adoption of the recommendations I make here would reduce the proposed budget by \$322,000. I have made no recommendation with regard to the amount requested for the full committee for reporting services, telephone, telegraph, supplies, witness fees, and miscellaneous or on the amount requested for the minority staff. I have no specific information on which to base an opinion, or a conclusion on these items.

I have been a member of the Committee on Education and Labor for the entire 10 years I have served in the Congress. These conclusions are based on a careful study of the committee budgets over this 10-year period of service. For 6 of these 10 years, the committee appropriation stayed the same with fairly high amounts turned back each session. Then for the 86th Congress, the appropriation increased markedly. During the last Congress this increased appropriation nearly doubled.

Here are the specific appropriations for the past 10 years. For the 83d Congress \$125,000 was authorized of which \$40,356 was returned. For the 84th Congress \$125,000 was authorized and \$68,971 was turned back. The 85th Congress saw \$125,000 again authorized with \$12,353 returned. The first big boost came during the 86th Congress when \$328,000 was authorized of which \$41,949 was turned back. For the 87th Congress \$633,000 was authorized and nothing was returned.

When the request was made last session for a near 100 percent increase, I spoke with several leaders in Congress at that time and urged that the budget be reduced. I pointed out then that the Committee on Education and Labor was about to be injected into activities not contemplated by the rules of the House.

I most respectfully yet urgently maintain that unless this budget request is reduced drastically, and travel and patronage of the committee diminished proportionately, respect for the committee will cease to exist, and embarrassment will be heaped upon the Congress and upon each Member individually.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on House Administration who has attended every session of that committee, the gentleman from Iowa seeks to clarify his position, his motives and his practice in the light of this afternoon's discussion.

His purpose has been twofold. First, it has been his goal to assist in developing the kinds of principles, policies, and procedures which create an atmosphere conducive to proper performance of our congressional duties. It has been his purpose to eliminate duplication of efforts which consume time of legislators, staff members, and committees already overburdened by obligations of our office. It has been his purpose to help in designing and implementing guidelines for expenditure of money so that the House can set an example in fiscal responsibility—so that we can say in truth, "Our porch has been swept"—and from that point we can in good conscience take necessary steps to insure wise use of tax moneys in other departments of the Government. This job, our House rules tell us, we must do.

There is, in the second instance, a deeper philosophic purpose. The U.S. House of Representatives is the greatest legislative body in the world. Its conception, the purposes to which it is dedi-

cated, the manner in which it is constituted, make it a true instrument of free government.

No government can long exist without the confidence of its citizens. The citizen must respect our high office—not tolerate it. The citizen must honor the office—not deprecate it. In America, the citizen must criticize the office—not ridicule it.

In turn we must treat our office as a seat of dignity and integrity and service and not a political prize to be won in a periodic political carnival.

Under the Constitution, the House and the Congress have prerogatives under a philosophy of separation of powers. This separation was by design, to prevent concentration of power in an executive. There have been moments in history when such concentration has been necessary and when it has been of benefit. In the end, continuation of such concentration can mean only the destruction of individual freedom and representative government. This is a consideration which must be pondered many times each session of the Congress. Much erosion of our constitutional authority has not been caused by theft. It has been given away. Too many times, we have succumbed to pressures. We have built in a custom under which legislative proposals are accompanied by reports from the administrative branch—reports which approve or disapprove the proposition under consideration. The Presidents now determine what the legislative proposals shall be, and in the effort which they call responsibility of leadership, try to dictate the course which the Congress shall pursue. The practice can be carried to an extreme at which traditional constitutional concepts are canceled or reversed. We even find ourselves considering propositions which would see the administrative branch legislating and the Congress having the veto power.

This distortion of separations of power are aided and abetted by the waywardness and the peregrinations and the lack of responsibility exhibited by a few Members of the Congress. One bad apple does not cause all other Members of the congressional barrel to spoil. But the presence of a few spoilers causes a deterioration in the attractiveness and the effectiveness of the Congress.

We have been subject to much criticism—some justified; most not justified. Our image is tarnished. Sometimes the portrait of the Congress is painfully photographic. Sometimes it is as distorted as the wildest surrealism. In either case, the best remedy is a good look at ourselves and the glass house in which we operate.

We can solve our own problems. In so doing we can restore the faith and confidence of our American citizens in their representative government. It is gratifying to note that we are making progress.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to repeat that we did receive a firm commitment from the

chairman of the full committee that \$55,000 a year would be made available to the minority. If we could have received some assurance that a proportionate share of the reduced amount being made available to the committee would be made available to the minority, this problem never would have developed. We need such reassurance now.

I would like to stress again that the role of the minority on the Education and Labor Committee is very considerable. To make my point clear, the minority now has only two employees on the staff. Over the past 2 years the majority has averaged about 50 employees.

I am going to put in some information with respect to what we have developed in the way of views of our own. The problem is that without adequate staff assistance we cannot perform satisfactorily. I have no desire to belabor this point, but I do think that as matters stand now we Republicans are left without any assurance. With these funds sharply reduced there is every prospect, despite all the good will in the world, that we will not have sufficient funds with which to operate in the next year.

The following tabulation provides an indication of the considerable responsibilities of the minority during the 87th Congress:

#### WORK OF THE MINORITY STAFF EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE—87TH CONGRESS

##### I. MINORITY AND SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS

###### Education, first session:

House Report No. 440, College Academic Facilities and Scholarship Act, H.R. 7215.  
House Report No. 445, School Assistance Act of 1961, H.R. 7300.

House Report No. 674, National Defense Education Act amendment of 1961, H.R. 7904.

House Report No. 674, National Defense Education Act amendment of 1961 (part 2).

###### Education, second session:

House Report No. 1551, Adult Basic Education Act of 1962, H.R. 10896.

House Report No. 1750, General University Extension Education Act of 1962, H.R. 11340.

House Report No. 1962, Migrant Agricultural Employees and Children, S. 1124. Educational Assistance Act of 1961, H.R. —.

###### Labor, first session:

House Report No. 75, Fair Labor Standards amendments of 1961, H.R. 3935.

House Report No. 879, Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961, H.R. 8399.

House Report No. 998, Welfare and Pension Plan amendments of 1961, H.R. 8723.

House Report No. 833, Youth Employment Opportunities Act of 1961, H.R. 8354.

###### Labor, second session:

House Report No. 1554, amendments to the Davis-Bacon Act, H.R. 10946.

House Report No. 1370, Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1962, H.R. 10144.

House Report No. 1719, Joint Industry promotion, H.R. 11537.

House Report No. 1963, National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor, S. 1132.

House Report No. 1666, Employment of Children in Agriculture, S. 1123.

House Report No. 1965, Occupational Safety Act of 1962, H.R. 12306.

House Report No. 1540, Youth Employment Opportunities Act of 1962, H.R. 10682.

##### II. SPECIAL INVESTIGATIVE SUBCOMMITTEES

1. Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation:

(a) Extensive hearings.



(b) Assisted in the preparation of the subcommittee report. (See House report dated September 1961.)

2. Subcommittee on the Administration of the National Labor Relations Act by the National Labor Relations Board:

(a) Extensive hearings.

(b) Minority and supplemental views prepared. (See House report dated September 1961.)

3. Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment:

(a) Extensive hearings.

(b) Supplemental views prepared. (See House report dated May 1962.)

4. Special Subcommittee inquiry on the administration of the Davis-Bacon Act:

(a) Extensive hearings.

(b) Report now being prepared.

5. Subcommittee on Irregularities in the Garment Industry:

(a) Extensive hearings.

(b) No report prepared.

6. Racial discrimination in schools receiving Federal assistance in federally impacted areas:

(a) Extensive hearings.

(b) Assisted in preparation of report. (See House Rept. No. 1751.)

### III. MAJOR FLOOR DEBATES

1. Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961 (H.R. 3935).

2. Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961 (H.R. 8399).

3. Welfare and Pension Plan Amendments of 1961 (H.R. 8723).

4. College Academic Facilities Act (H.R. 8900).

5. School Lunch Act as amended (H.R. 11665).

6. Equal Pay Act of 1962 (H.R. 11880).

7. Amendment to Fair Labor Standards Act dealing with child labor (S. 1123).

### IV. MINORITY SUBSTITUTE BILLS ADOPTED BY HOUSE

1. Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961 (H.R. 3935).

2. Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961 (H.R. 8723).

### V. HOUSE-SENATE CONFERENCES

1. Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961 (H.R. 3935).

2. Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961 (H.R. 8399).

3. Welfare and Pension Plan Amendments of 1961 (H.R. 8723).

4. College Academic Facilities Act (H.R. 8900).

5. School Lunch Act as amended (H.R. 11665).

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Administration Committee and a member of the Subcommittee on Accounts of that committee, I have consistently opposed the granting of Chairman POWELL's budget request for \$697,000. I have maintained that his budget should be cut to the bare essential needed for his committee to function because of the unacceptable manner in which he has served in his capacity as chairman. I would advocate even greater cuts in his budget except for the fact that I do not want to cripple the good men who are members of his committee and who have

consistently done a good job. With the addition of further restrictions as to how and by whom this money is spent and for what purpose it is spent, I hope we can by this action, restore the faith of the people in this committee and in the Congress. Certainly that is my desire.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the restriction of \$25,000 for each subcommittee provided in the budget for the Committee on Education and Labor is one with which I, as a chairman, can live. I will have to live with it. But it will impair our efficiency.

During the 87th Congress when we were on a 2-year budget, each subcommittee was given \$26,000 per year—a total of \$52,000. I was the chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education. Salaries of staff employees of the subcommittee amounted to about \$20,000 per year. During 1962 I spent \$21,103.79 on salaries of personnel. I spent approximately \$1,000 per year on office supplies—items from the stationery room—long-distance telephone calls and telegrams. The balance, something less than \$4,000 per year, was spent on travel.

The subcommittee conducted 2 days of hearings in San Francisco and 2 days in New York City in our study of the economic problems in the performing arts. We had 1 day of hearings jointly with the General Subcommittee on Labor in Morehead, Ky., and 1 day of hearings in Providence, R.I.

Legislation from my subcommittee that eventually was reported to the House included the general university extension bill, the Federal Advisory Council on Arts bill, the quality in education bill, and the educational and training films for the deaf bill. This latter became Public Law 87-715. In addition my subcommittee shared in the consideration of legislation to extend and expand the National Defense Education Act, which was also reported to the House. My subcommittee also reported to the full committee a bill to establish a Carver Memorial Library.

The 87th Congress, in its wisdom, provided for a 7-percent pay raise for all Federal employees, including employees of the House of Representatives. On the \$25,000 which is being made available for the Special Subcommittee on Labor which I am heading now, I am either going to have to take that pay raise away from my staff employees, or the subcommittee can conduct no field hearings or field investigations. In either case—and I cannot expect my staff to take the full burden of this action—we shall be hampered in discharging our responsibility to the Congress.

My subcommittee's jurisdiction embraces the Taft-Hartley Act, the Landrum-Griffin Act, the National Labor Relations Board, and the Equal Pay Act of 1963, upon which hearings are scheduled. We shall also have such other matters as the chairman may see fit to assign.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the Committee on House Administration for this action in which

it has vindicated the entire membership of this House. Because of the manner in which the affairs of the Committee on Education and Labor have been conducted during the past 2 years, I feel that each Member of this body was in the position of deciding whether or not we should condone and continue the policies which will now be held in close check due to the timely action of this watchdog committee.

Some will say that the cuts are too deep. I think not. As the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] so well put it, it will very definitely mean cutting back on some of the employees whom we never saw, rarely heard of, and little benefited by. It will mean fewer opportunities for lavish spending, fewer trips, and without doubt, less waste of taxpayers' money. The basic work of our committee will be accomplished on the fourth floor suite of the Old House Office Building. It will be accomplished by Members of Congress whose pay is not charged against this committee. If we buckle down and proceed expeditiously, we can do as much or more with less costly expenditure. The effort of the committee members and not the dollars expended will be the true test of accomplishment.

What we have done today, however, is but a first step in getting our own House in order. The chairman of the Rules Committee has promised to tighten up the provisions for overseas travel, not only for our committee but for the entire membership of this body. Other expenditures should be scrutinized.

It seems ridiculous to me that our State Department should be in the position of arranging for the overseas travel of Members of this body. At a time when world conditions command every ounce of resourcefulness and initiative that we can display, why should we put them in the position of being advance men for those of us who travel in foreign countries.

I would like to read a telegram that they sent to their embassies last summer as a case in point, and I quote:

Congressman ADAM C. POWELL, chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, accompanied by Mrs. Tamara J. Wall and Miss Corrine Huff, staff members, traveling Western Europe accordance following itinerary:

August 8 sailing *Queen Mary* arriving Southampton, August 13; Paris, August 16; Venice, August 20; Rome, August 23; Athens, August 27; Delphi, August 30; sailing *Leonardo da Vinci*, September 15 from Gibraltar. Arrival times and flights forwarded when firm.

Provisions handbook congressional travel apply. Codel and party authorized use local currencies 19FT561 funds. Meet assist appoint control officers.

Request one single and one double with bath as follows: London-Cumberland Marbel Arch Hotel; Paris Hotel San Regis; Venice Royal Denielli; Rome (1) Excelsior (2) Flora (3) Victoria whichever has special embassy rates; Athens beachhouse at Astir Hotel Delphi new government hotel name unknown. Confirm Department soonest.

London, request three tickets August 14 and 15, best shows playing, except Broadway plays.

Paris-Codel desires use U.S. Army car and chauffeur. Reserve three for first show and dinner best table Lido August 16.

Southampton-Codel requests be met at *Queen Mary* Cherbourg with \$100 U.S. equivalent in local currencies for each member party.

Mr. Speaker, let me again say that I commend Chairman BURLISON and the members of this committee as well as the entire body of the House for the action taken today. Let us not forget that it is merely a start.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution as amended is agreed to, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have permission to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

#### NURSERY STOCK, PLANT, AND SEEDS QUARANTINE NO. 37

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 1, 1963, the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture held a hearing with respect to the proposed amendment to nursery stock, plant, and seeds quarantine No. 37.

The proposed change would permit growing media in which plants were grown in foreign countries to be brought into this country, and would require the United States to furnish specifications for buildings and employees to supervise production of foreign plants in foreign countries for as much as 2 years.

The proposal by the Department would not be limited to letting azaleas into the country from Belgium, but would in effect provide a change in policy which would permit foreign countries to bring into the United States growing media which admittedly "could" serve to bring in the thousands of injurious pests and diseases which, fortunately, we do not yet have.

The Government has spent hundreds of millions of dollars because of them. Notwithstanding these facts, there are probably 20,000 injurious insects and diseases which we do not yet have in this country, which according to the Department would endanger up to \$30 billion worth of crops annually if ever they reached here.

The Department's proposal to supply employees to provide specifications for buildings and supervise the growing

plants in foreign countries for as long as 2 years, though the cost of such employees would be repaid by the foreign country. This would be taking a further step along the road of providing assistance to foreign growers to enable them to better compete with U.S. growers. If we were to furnish Department of Agriculture employees to help foreign producers, as is proposed in this case, where are we going to draw the line?

If you once start this, there is no telling how far it will go. I hope that the Members will secure copies of these hearings and see how dangerous this proposed change would be.

Even now, we are intercepting an injurious insect coming into this country every 16 minutes of every day.

Mr. Speaker, we have therefore asked the Secretary to cancel this proposed amendment.

#### THE MICA STOCKPILE PROGRAM

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, when the Government program of purchasing mica for the national defense stockpile terminated in July of 1962, thousands of North Carolinians, engaged in the production of this critical mineral, were thrown out of employment.

While a number of counties in western North Carolina were affected by the termination of the mica stockpile program, two counties in my congressional district suffered unusual economic hardship through the loss of jobs brought about by the closing of the program. I refer to the counties of Avery and Mitchell.

The counties have some of the finest mica in the United States. Approximately 3,500 people, miners and mica processors, were engaged in the stockpile program while it was in operation. Now that the program has terminated, many of these people have been left without suitable employment. The counties of Avery and Mitchell have been declared depressed areas by the Federal Government, and the Area Redevelopment Administration is making an effort to create new job opportunities for those who were left without jobs when the stockpile program was terminated.

Mr. Speaker, while mica is a mineral vital to our defense requirements in time of war, it is also a mineral that must be in plentiful supply to keep the wheels of industry turning in time of peace. I believe it would be a great economic tragedy for our mica mines to close, not only in North Carolina but in those other areas of the Nation where mica can be mined successfully.

While we feel we have enough mica on hand at the present time to satisfy future requirements in time of peace and war, no one can definitely predict the course of future events in our country. In my opinion I feel that the only safe

course we can follow is to keep our mica mines in operation. Not only will we be keeping an industry alive necessary to our security, we will be affording employment opportunities to thousands of people, many of whom are living in areas that are receiving assistance through various Federal programs.

In order to keep our mica mines open, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to establish a program for the purchase and resale of domestically produced, newly mined, processed mica and mica ore. The bill which I have introduced calls for a new type of Government purchase program. It would give the Department of the Interior the authority to purchase mica for a period of 5 years.

During each 90 days while the purchase program is in effect an auction will be held by the Department of the Interior for the purpose of selling to domestic users and fabricators the mica acquired during the previous quarter. The funds received by the Secretary of the Interior for the mica could then be used for the purchase of additional mica and for expenses involved in carrying on the program.

The price of mica under the provisions of my bill would be at the level established at the time the General Services Administration stockpile mica purchase program terminated in July of 1962. My bill provides that the Department of the Interior can expend a sum not to exceed \$5 million each year in the form of a subsidy to equalize the difference between the amount received from the sale of mica at the auctions and the total price paid to the producer. The program to be set up under my measure would terminate on July 1, 1968.

Mr. Speaker, the idea of a subsidy to keep vital industries in operation in our Nation is not new to our economic system. While I am not one who advocates indiscriminate use of subsidies, I nevertheless feel that the overriding considerations of national defense and economic hardship for mica miners certainly justify the imposition of a small temporary subsidy to keep our mica mines operating. It is my sincere hope, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues in the Congress will join with me in supporting my bill.

#### THE CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an analysis and copy of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on February 28, 1963, I introduced a bill—H.R. 4415—whose purpose is to provide for the mounting of a comprehensive national effort to control the great scourge of air pollution which presently jeopardizes the health and well-being of our Nation and which, unless prompt action is taken, will become increasingly severe over the next few years.



The need for such an effort has become increasingly apparent to me after careful study of the problem in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The problem of air pollution has been under consideration by the committee for many years. In 1955, the committee reported favorably on the basic legislation establishing the present Federal air pollution research and technical assistance program.

In 1956, the Special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety of the committee made a study of noxious, toxic, and harmful motor vehicle exhaust fumes in connection with a comprehensive investigation of highway traffic fumes in connection with a comprehensive investigation of highway traffic safety. Testimony was taken and research activities of the industry were studied on visits to manufacturing plants.

Hearings have been held by the Health and Safety Subcommittee in 1958, 1959, 1960, and 1962 on various bills concerned with extension of the Federal air pollution program and on the progress being made in air pollution control, particularly with regard to motor vehicle exhausts.

In 1959, the committee reported favorably on legislation to extend the Federal air pollution program—Public Law 86-365—and in 1960, a favorable committee report was made on a bill requiring increased emphasis on research into the motor vehicle exhaust problem and a report to Congress on the results of such investigations—Public Law 86-493.

Last year, the committee reported favorably on legislation to extend the Federal program for an additional period of 2 years and to enact into permanent law the substance of Public Law 86-493 requiring the Surgeon General specifically to conduct studies on motor vehicle exhaust as it affects human health through the pollution of air—Public Law 87-761.

Thus, over the course of years the air pollution problem has been carefully studied. During these years significant progress has been made, through research, in understanding the nature of the problem and the methods for its control. But, in comparison with the magnitude of the problem, far too little has been done at all levels of government, to actually apply the knowledge we now possess to control the existing problem and to prevent its aggravation in the future. The record of the National Conference on Air Pollution documents in detail the nature of the problem and the terrible threat to our Nation's health and well-being which it poses. And to this record of words, the London smog of only 3 months ago, in which hundreds of people in that great metropolis became ill and died, should serve as a grim reminder that action to protect the purity of the air we breathe can no longer be delayed.

What is the nature of this threat? Looking superficially at the vastness of the air resources available to the entire country, it would seem a virtual impossibility to seriously threaten it. But the problem can be understood when it

is realized that only a small part of the vast supply is available for our use in any single location. Over one-half of our population now lives on less than 10 percent of the land area of the country. For the most part, sources of air pollution are concentrated where people are concentrated. Furthermore, there is every indication that by 1970 two-thirds of our population at that time will live in this same limited land area.

We are already overburdening those portions of the air resource available to many of our cities. Few people realize the enormous magnitude of the quantities of pollutants being discharged to the atmosphere. In one of our larger American cities a well-known research institute has estimated the emissions of pollutants at 25,000 tons daily—comprised of a great variety of contaminant gases and liquid and solid aerosols. Despite daily and seasonal variations, the air supply available to this city, as to our other cities, is basically fixed, and the ability of the atmosphere to dilute and disperse pollutants is limited.

Air pollution is a heavy economic burden to this country, causing extensive economic damage through its effects on animal and plant life, the corrosion and soiling of materials and structures, depreciation of property values, interference with air and surface transport, and losses of unburnt fuel. Estimates of such losses have tended to increase as research has progressed on these problems. Thus, in the case of agricultural losses, estimates of damage to crops in southern California have risen from \$500,000 in 1939, to over \$3 million in 1953, and over \$8 million in 1958. It is reported informally that truck crop losses from air pollution in New Jersey have recently totaled many millions of dollars annually. Summation of estimates of the various types of economic damage from air pollution have led a number of investigators to conclude that these may amount to over \$11 billion a year.

Of even greater concern are its adverse effects on human health. Research conducted over the past several years has produced a growing body of evidence which indicates that the long-term effects of exposure of community populations to ordinary concentrations of air pollutants adversely affects the health of many and may result in chronic disease, and premature death. Air pollution has been linked with increased mortality from cardiorespiratory causes, increased susceptibility to respiratory disease, and interference with normal respiratory functions. Specific diseases associated in one degree or another with air pollution are emphysema, chronic bronchitis, asthma, and lung cancer.

When we combine the threat to health posed by air pollution and the economic damages it causes, it appears clear that we must put to work all of the procedures which are now available for use in the control of air pollution. At a technical level, procedures are available by which the majority of air pollutants can be controlled or prevented, generally at costs far below the social costs to the Nation of economic damage, illness, and death which is associated with air pollution.

The fact that for some types of pollutants technically feasible control methods are not available and the need for additional research concerning the nature and effects of the problem does not provide justifiable reasons for waiting to do what can be done now.

Over the past several years, on requests from the Surgeon General, the President, and the Congress, several committees composed of highly qualified people have examined the problem of air pollution in the United States and the actions needed in coping with it. All of these groups have emphasized the essentiality of preserving the quality of our air resource and the need for more research and technically trained manpower, and greater application of our available technology in preventing air pollution.

The wide-scale application of available technical procedures is dependent upon the development and operation of community programs on State and local government levels. Here, the situation nationally is far from adequate for dealing effectively with the needs for air pollution control. With respect to our urban population, approximately 90 percent lives in localities having air pollution problems. It is estimated that all 232 communities in this country with a population greater than 50,000 have air pollution problems; approximately 40 percent of the communities in the 2,500 to 50,000 population range have problems. In total, about 6,000 communities in the United States have air pollution problems of varying degrees for which action programs should be initiated or strengthened as soon as practicable.

At this time, there are only 106 local control programs on record which have full-time staffs. These programs serve 342 local political jurisdictions, which comprise about 45 percent of the national urban population. Only 28 of these control programs have 5 or more full-time employees. There is an additional number of local programs with part-time staffs. The median annual expenditure is about 10 cents per capita, an amount highly inadequate to do the job which is necessary to attain effective control.

On the State level, during the past decade, there has been some improvement in the status of State air pollution legislation and the development of comprehensive programs dealing with problems in this area. Thus, about 15 States now have enactments which authorize the conduct of specific programs, whereas no State had such authorization as of 1950. But, the inadequacies of these programs is reflected in the fact that little more than \$2 million was spent for air pollution by all States in 1961 and that, of this, more than \$1 million was spent by the State of California.

Air pollution control practices currently are largely pragmatic in character, with regulatory requirements necessarily based on judgments as to what control measures are technically and economically feasible. More rational air quality criteria and standards are desirable and can be developed as we improved our knowledge through research

and improved understanding of local and regional problems.

Nationally, it is clear we have a long way to go and a lot of catching up to do in dealing adequately with problems of air pollution. It is particularly important in this connection that State and local government air pollution control programs be extended in coverage and strengthened in depth to cope with the complex technical problems with which they must deal. Further, in recognition of the fact that the air currents respect no boundaries, authority needs to be given to the National Government to control interstate problems when the States fail to do so.

The ultimate national objective in air pollution control is to protect the quality of the air resource used in common by the American people to the end that: First, death and sickness caused by polluted air will be prevented; and second, property damage and economic loss from air pollution will be minimized. In support of these recommendations, I have introduced H.R. 4415. As noted earlier the bill is the product of years of study by myself and the other members of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety. In these studies, particular note should be made of the role of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman PAUL F. SCHENCK, who has made such outstanding contributions to the work of the subcommittee and whose concern for the problems caused by motor vehicle exhausts is reflected in this bill.

The purpose of the bill I have introduced is to develop a comprehensive national program for the prevention and control of air pollution, providing for Federal leadership while recognizing the fundamental responsibilities of State and local governments.

The bill provides for—

First. Establishment of a national research and development program for air pollution prevention and control, including continuation of investigations into the motor vehicle emission problem.

Second. A 5-year, \$30 million matching grant program to State and local agencies to assist them in establishing, improving, and maintaining programs for the prevention and control of air pollution.

Third. Enforcement measures against air pollution, with Federal enforcement of interstate pollution, and State enforcement of intrastate pollution. Federal, State, and local governments would become partners in effective action to abate pollution.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the full text of the bill and a section-by-section analysis in the RECORD at this point:

#### CLEAN AIR ACT—SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF H.R. 4415

##### SECTION 1. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

This section makes congressional findings that the predominant part of the Nation's population live in urban areas which are generally interstate in character; that air pollution has become a serious and major problem especially in these areas; that the primary responsibility for solving this problem rests with State and local governments; and that Federal leadership and financial assistance are essential for the development of

cooperative Federal, State, regional, and local programs.

The purposes of the act are to protect the Nation's air resource; initiate and accelerate a national research and development program; provide technical and financial assistance to State and local programs; and encourage regional program development.

##### SECTION 2. COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES AND UNIFORM LAWS

(a) This subsection provides that the Secretary shall:

1. Encourage cooperative activities by the State and local governments for prevention and control of air pollution.

2. Encourage the enactment of improved and uniform laws where practicable.

3. Encourage agreements and compacts between States for prevention and control of air pollution.

(b) This subsection requires that the Secretary cooperate with and encourage cooperative activities by all Federal departments—so as to assure utilization of all facilities and resources of the Federal Government.

(c) Consent of Congress is given to two or more States to negotiate and enter into agreements or compacts for (1) cooperative effort and mutual assistance and (2) for establishment of agencies joint or otherwise for prevention and control of air pollution. No compact or agreement is binding until approved by the Congress.

##### SECTION 3. RESEARCH, INVESTIGATION, TRAINING, AND OTHER ACTIVITIES

Subsection (a) requires the Secretary to establish a national research and development program for prevention and control of air pollution. As a part of such a program:

It is provided that the Federal Government shall conduct and promote the coordination and acceleration of research, investigations, training, demonstrations, surveys and studies relating to the causes, effects, and prevention and control of air pollution; encourage, cooperate with and render technical and financial assistance to local and State agencies.

That the Secretary conduct investigations, research, and surveys concerning any specific problem of air pollution if he is requested to do so or if, in his judgment such a problem may affect or be of concern to communities in various parts of the Nation or is interstate in nature with a view to recommending a solution to the problem.

The Secretary would specifically be required to conduct studies regarding the discharges from motor vehicles from the standpoint of human health.

Subsection (b) authorizes the Secretary in carrying out the provisions of the preceding subsection to:

1. Collect and distribute information pertaining to research and other activities including appropriate recommendations.

2. Cooperate with other Federal, State, and local departments and agencies and with private organizations, including industry, in the preparation and conduct of research activities.

3. Make grants to air pollution control agencies and other agencies and individuals for the conduct of appropriate air pollution programs; upon such terms and conditions as he may determine.

4. Enter into contracts for the conduct of research, investigations, training, and other authorized activities.

5. Provide training for and make training grants to qualified individuals.

6. Establish and maintain research fellowships in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and at public or non-profit private educational institutions, etc.

7. Collect and disseminate basic data relating to the prevention and control of air pollution; chemical, physical, and biological air quality data.

8. Develop effective and practical processes, methods, and prototype devices for the prevention or control of air pollution.

9. Recommend to air pollution control agencies and other appropriate organizations such criteria of air quality, after such research as may be necessary to protect the public health and welfare.

##### SECTION 4. GRANTS FOR SUPPORT OF AIR POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAMS

(a) Authorizes to be appropriated \$30 million over a 5-year period for grants to air pollution control agencies in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining program for prevention and control of air pollution. Such sums remain available during fiscal year appropriated and the succeeding fiscal year.

(b) The Secretary is required to make allotments to States, in accordance with regulations, on the basis of (1) population, (2) extent of the problem, and (3) financial need of the respective States.

(c) From each State's allotment the Secretary is authorized to make grants to air pollution control agencies in an amount equal to two-thirds of the cost of establishing and maintaining such programs. Grants equal to three-fourths of such cost may be made to regional air pollution programs meeting specified criteria. Interstate air pollution agency grants will be made from the allotments of the constituent States.

(d) Grants to be made in accordance with regulations and terms and conditions of the Secretary.

(e) Funds allotted to a State which have not been obligated by the end of the fiscal year because of a lack of approvable applications shall be reallocated by the Secretary to other States.

##### SECTION 5. ABATEMENT OF AIR POLLUTION

Interstate pollution: In the case of air pollution which is endangering the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge originates, the Secretary is empowered to call a conference of the air pollution control agencies of the States involved either at the request of the State or States involved (including municipalities with the concurrence of the State agency) or on his own initiative. The purpose of the conference is to determine the extent of the pollution problem, what is being done about it, and the nature of any delays being encountered in abatement work. Following the conference, if the Secretary believes that effective progress is not being made toward abatement he shall recommend appropriate remedial action. If after 6 months such action has not been taken, the Secretary shall call a public hearing. Each State involved will be able to choose one member of the hearing board. The hearing board shall hear evidence and make findings on the basis of such evidence as to whether pollution exists and whether effective progress toward abatement is being made. The board will recommend appropriate remedial measures if such are necessary. The findings and recommendations of the board will be sent by the Secretary to those causing or contributing to the pollution and to the States and local air pollution control agencies with a notice specifying a reasonable time (not less than 6 months) to secure abatement. If appropriate action is not taken in the specified time, the Secretary can request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement. The court giving due consideration to the practicability and to the physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved, will have jurisdiction to enter such judgment, and orders enforcing such judgment, as the public interest and the equities of the case may require.

Intrastate pollution: The same procedure as above is followed in cases involving pollution occurring wholly within one State



except that Federal action can be taken only at the request of the Governor of a State or a State air pollution agency or a municipality with the concurrence of the State agency. Such findings and recommendations shall be turned over to the Governor or Attorney General for appropriate State action. The Secretary would be authorized, upon the request of the Governor or Attorney General, to provide technical and other assistance necessary to assist the State in judicial proceedings to secure abatement under State or local law.

In all cases of intrastate air pollution it is required that the municipality affected or the municipality in which such pollution originates either has made or concurred in the request to the Secretary for the holding of a conference and subsequent actions as provided in this section. The Secretary is further granted the discretion of not calling a conference if in his judgment the effect of such pollution is not of such significance as to warrant the exercise of Federal jurisdiction under this section.

**Federal property:** The Secretary is required to include in his summary of any conference references to any discharges contributing to air pollution from Federal property. Notices of hearings involving any pollution alleged to be affected by such discharges shall be given to the Federal agency having jurisdiction.

#### SECTION 6. REQUIREMENT OF REPORTS

(a) This section authorizes the Secretary to require any person whose activities result in the emission of air pollution which has been the subject of a conference under section 5 to file reports relating to the character, kind and quantity of pollutants discharged and the use of devices or other means to prevent or reduce the emission of pollutants. All information bearing on trade secrets and similar matters in such reports is considered confidential.

(b) Failure to file reports within the time fixed by the Secretary will result in a \$100 forfeiture for each day of such failure. The Secretary is further authorized to remit or mitigate such forfeiture.

(c) Requires the various U.S. attorneys under the direction of the Attorney General to prosecute for recovery forfeitures.

#### SECTION 7. COOPERATION BY FEDERAL AGENCIES TO CONTROL AIR POLLUTION FROM FEDERAL FACILITIES

This section presents the intent of the Congress that Federal departments and agencies should, to the extent practicable and consistent with the interests of the United States and within any available appropriations, cooperate with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and with air pollution control agencies in preventing and controlling air pollution from Federal facilities.

#### SECTION 8. INFORMATION AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC

This section requires that all information, uses, products, processes, patents, and other developments be made available to the public from research contracted for, sponsored, cosponsored, or otherwise authorized under the provisions of the bill. The rights of the owner of any background patent are protected.

#### SECTION 9. ADMINISTRATION

Regulations and delegation of functions: Subsection (a) provides that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out his functions under the act, and to delegate his functions except the making of regulations.

Loans of Federal personnel: Subsection (b) would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare upon the request of an air pollution control agency, to detail personnel of the Public Health Service to

such an agency. The provisions of section 214(d) of the PHS Act shall be applicable with respect to such personnel.

Grant payment methods: Subsection (c) authorizes the payment of grants, under the act, in advance, in installments, or by way of reimbursement.

#### SECTION 10. DEFINITIONS

This section defines the term "Secretary" as meaning the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The term "air pollution control agency" means a single State agency designated by the Governor thereof; an agency established by two or more States; a city, county, or other local government health authority or other single agency having specific responsibility; an agency of two or more municipalities in the same or different States.

The term "interstate air pollution control agency" means an air pollution control agency established by two or more States or two or more municipalities in different States.

The District of Columbia, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam are included in the term "State".

Definitions are also included for the terms "person" and "municipality".

#### SECTION 11. OTHER AUTHORITY NOT AFFECTED

This section provides that the act shall not be construed as superseding or limiting the authorities and responsibilities, under any other provision of law, of the Secretary or of any other Federal officer, department, or agency.

#### SECTION 12. SEPARABILITY

This section contains a standard separability clause.

#### SECTION 13. SHORT TITLE

This section would amend the present act to provide that the act may be cited as the "Clean Air Act."

#### H.R. 4415

A bill to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of July 14, 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1857-1857g), is hereby amended to read as follows:

#### "FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

"Sec. 1. (a) The Congress finds—

"(1) that the predominant part of the Nation's population is located in its rapidly expanding metropolitan and other urban areas, which generally cross the boundary lines of local jurisdictions and often extend into two or more States;

"(2) that the growth in the amount and complexity of air pollution brought about by urbanization, industrial development, and the increasing use of motor vehicles, has resulted in mounting dangers to the public health and welfare, injury to agricultural crops and livestock, damage to and the deterioration of property, and hazards to air and ground transportation;

"(3) that the prevention and control of air pollution at its source is the primary responsibility of States and local governments; and

"(4) that Federal financial assistance and leadership is essential for the development of cooperative Federal, State, regional, and local programs to prevent and control air pollution.

"(b) The purposes of this Act are—

"(1) to protect the Nation's air resources so as to promote the public health and welfare and the productive capacity of its population;

"(2) to initiate and accelerate a national research and development program to achieve the prevention and control of air pollution;

"(3) to provide technical and financial assistance to State and local governments in connection with the development and execution of their air pollution prevention and control programs; and

"(4) to encourage and assist the development and operation of regional air pollution control programs.

#### "COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES AND UNIFORM LAWS

"Sec. 2. (a) The Secretary shall encourage cooperative activities by the States and local governments for the prevention and control of air pollution; encourage the enactment of improved and, so far as practicable in the light of varying conditions and needs, uniform State and local laws relating to the prevention and control of air pollution; and encourage the making of agreements and compacts between States for the prevention and control of air pollution.

"(b) The Secretary shall cooperate with and encourage cooperative activities by all Federal departments and agencies having functions relating to the prevention and control of air pollution, so as to assure the utilization in the Federal air pollution control program of all appropriate and available facilities and resources within the Federal Government.

"(c) The consent of the Congress is hereby given to two or more States to negotiate and enter into agreements or compacts, not in conflict with any law or treaty of the United States, for (1) cooperative effort and mutual assistance for the prevention and control of air pollution and the enforcement of their respective laws relating thereto, and (2) the establishment of such agencies, joint or otherwise, as they may deem desirable for making effective such agreements or compacts. No such agreement or compact shall be binding or obligatory upon any State a party thereto unless and until it has been approved by Congress.

#### "RESEARCH, INVESTIGATIONS, TRAINING, AND OTHER ACTIVITIES

"Sec. 3. (a) The Secretary shall establish a national research and development program for the prevention and control of air pollution and as part of such program shall—

"(1) conduct, and promote the coordination and acceleration of, research, investigations, experiments, training, demonstrations, surveys, and studies relating to the causes, effects, extent, prevention, and control of air pollution; and

"(2) encourage, cooperate with, and render technical services and provide financial assistance to air pollution control agencies and other appropriate public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and individuals in the conduct of such activities; and

"(3) conduct investigations and research and make surveys concerning any specific problem of air pollution confronting any air pollution control agency with a view to recommending a solution of such problem, if he is requested to do so by such agency or if, in his judgment, such problem may affect or be of concern to communities in various parts of the Nation or may affect any community or communities in a State other than that in which the source of the matter causing or contributing to the pollution is located.

"(4) in view of the nationwide significance of the problems of air pollution from motor vehicles, conduct studies of the amounts and kinds of substances discharged from the exhausts of motor vehicles and of the effects of the discharge of such substances, including the amounts and kinds of such substances which, from the standpoint of human health, it is safe for motor vehicles to discharge into the atmosphere.

"(b) In carrying out the provisions of the preceding subsection the Secretary is authorized to—

"(1) collect and make available, through publications and other appropriate means, the results of and other information, including appropriate recommendations by him in connection therewith, pertaining to such research and other activities;

"(2) cooperate with other Federal departments and agencies, with air pollution control agencies, with other public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and with any industries involved, in the preparation and conduct of such research and other activities;

"(3) make grants to air pollution control agencies, to other public or nonprofit private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and to individuals, upon such terms and conditions as he may determine;

"(4) contract with public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and with individuals, without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529; 41 U.S.C. 5);

"(5) provide training for, and make training grants to, personnel of air pollution control agencies and other persons with suitable qualifications;

"(6) establish and maintain research fellowships, in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and at public or nonprofit private educational institutions or research organizations;

"(7) collect and disseminate, in cooperation with other Federal departments and agencies, and with other public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations having related responsibilities, basic data on chemical, physical, and biological air quality and other information pertaining to air pollution and the prevention and control thereof;

"(8) develop effective and practical processes, methods, and prototype devices for the prevention or control of air pollution; and

"(9) recommend to air pollution control agencies and to other appropriate organizations, after such research as he determines to be necessary, such criteria of air quality as in his judgment may be necessary to protect the public health and welfare.

#### "GRANTS FOR SUPPORT OF AIR POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAMS

"Sec. 4. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, \$6,000,000 for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and \$7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, for grants to air pollution control agencies to assist them in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining programs for the prevention and control of air pollution. Sums so appropriated shall remain available for making grants as provided in this section during the fiscal year for which appropriated and the succeeding fiscal year.

"(b) From the sums available therefor for any fiscal year the Secretary shall from time to time make allotments to the several States, in accordance with regulations, on the basis of (1) the population, (2) the extent of the air pollution problem, and (3) the financial need of the respective States. For purposes of this section, population shall be determined on the basis of the latest figures furnished by the Department of Commerce, and per capita income for each State and for the United States shall be determined on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the continental United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

"(c) From each State's allotment under paragraph (b) for any fiscal year, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to air pollution control agencies in such State in an amount equal to two-thirds of the cost of establishing and maintaining programs for the prevention and control of air pollu-

tion: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized to make grants to air pollution control agencies described in section 10(b) (2) or (4) in an amount equal to three-fourths of the cost of establishing and maintaining regional air pollution control programs which meet criteria established in regulations by the Secretary as necessary for the effective control of air pollution in the area: *And provided further*, That in the case of grants to an interstate air pollution control agency (as defined in this Act) the grant shall be made from the allotments of the several States which are members of such agency on such basis as the Secretary finds reasonable and equitable. As used in this subsection, the term "regional air pollution control program" means a program for the prevention and control of air pollution in an area that includes the areas of two or more municipalities, whether in the same State or different States.

"(d) Such grants shall be made, in accordance with regulations, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may find necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(e) Sums allotted to a State under subsection (b) of this section which have not been obligated by the end of the fiscal year for which they were allotted because of a lack of approval applications shall be reallocated by the Secretary, on such basis as he determines to be reasonable and equitable and in accordance with regulations promulgated by him, to States from which approvable applications have been made but which have not been approved for grants because of a lack of funds in the allotment of such State. Any sum made available to a State by reallocation under the preceding sentence shall be in addition to any funds otherwise allotted to such State under this Act and shall be available for grants to air pollution control agencies in such State.

#### "ABATEMENT OF AIR POLLUTION

"Sec. 5. (a) The pollution of the air in any State or States which endangers the health or welfare of any persons, shall be subject to abatement as provided in this section.

"(b) Consistent with the policy declaration of this Act, municipal, State, and interstate action to abate air pollution shall be encouraged and shall not be displaced by Federal enforcement action except as otherwise provided by or pursuant to a court order under subsection (f) (1).

"(c) (1) (A) Whenever requested by the Governor of any State, a State air pollution control agency, or (with the concurrence of the State air pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated) the governing body of any municipality, the Secretary shall, if such request refers to air pollution which is alleged to endanger the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, give formal notification thereof to the air pollution control agency of the municipality where such discharge or discharges originate, to the air pollution control agency of the State in which such municipality is located, and to the interstate air pollution control agency, if any, in whose jurisdictional area such municipality is located, and shall call promptly a conference of such agency or agencies and of the air pollution control agencies of the municipalities which may be adversely affected by such pollution, and the air pollution control agency, if any, of each State, or for each area, in which any such municipality is located.

"(B) Whenever requested by the Governor of any State, a State air pollution control agency, or (with the concurrence of the State air pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated)

the governing body of any municipality, the Secretary shall, if such request refers to alleged air pollution which is endangering the health or welfare of persons only in the State in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate and if a municipality affected by such air pollution, or the municipality in which such pollution originates, has either made or concurred in such request, give formal notification thereof to the State air pollution control agency, to the air pollution control agencies of the municipality where such discharge or discharges originate and of the municipality or municipalities alleged to be adversely affected thereby, and to any interstate air pollution control agency, whose jurisdictional area includes any such municipality, and shall promptly call a conference of such agency or agencies, unless, in the judgment of the Secretary, the effect of such pollution is not of such significance as to warrant exercise of Federal jurisdiction under this section.

"(C) The Secretary shall also call such a conference whenever, on the basis of reports, surveys, or studies, he has reason to believe that any pollution referred to in subsection (a) is endangering the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges originate is occurring.

"(2) The agencies called to attend such conference may bring such persons as they desire to the conference. Not less than three weeks' prior notice of the conference date shall be given to such agencies.

"(3) Following this conference, the Secretary shall prepare and forward to all air pollution control agencies attending the conference a summary of conference discussions including (A) occurrence of air pollution subject to abatement under this Act; (B) adequacy of measures taken toward abatement of the pollution; and (C) nature of delays, if any, being encountered in abating the pollution.

"(d) If the Secretary believes, upon the conclusion of the conference or thereafter, that effective progress toward abatement of such pollution is not being made and that the health or welfare of any persons is being endangered, he shall recommend to the appropriate State or municipal air pollution control agency (or to both such agencies) that it take necessary remedial action. The Secretary shall allow at least six months from the date he makes such recommendations for the taking of such recommended action.

"(e) (1) If, at the conclusion of the period so allowed, such remedial action or other action which in the judgment of the Secretary is reasonably calculated to secure abatement of such pollution has not been taken, the Secretary shall call a public hearing, to be held in or near one or more of the places where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originated, before a hearing board of five or more persons appointed by the Secretary. Each State in which any discharge causing or contributing to such pollution originates and each State claiming to be adversely affected by such pollution shall be given an opportunity to select one member of such hearing board and at least one member shall be a representative of the Department of Commerce, and not less than a majority of such hearing board shall be persons other than officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At least three weeks' prior notice of such hearing shall be given to the State, interstate, and municipal air pollution control agencies called to attend such hearing and to the alleged polluter or polluters.

"(2) On the basis of evidence presented at such hearing, the hearing board shall make findings as to whether pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring and



whether effective progress toward abatement thereof is being made. If the hearing board finds such pollution is occurring and effective progress toward abatement thereof is not being made it shall make recommendations to the Secretary concerning the measures, if any, which it finds to be reasonable and suitable to secure abatement of such pollution.

"(3) The Secretary shall send such findings and recommendations to the person or persons discharging any matter causing or contributing to such pollution; to air pollution control agencies of the State or States and of the municipality or municipalities where such discharge or discharges originate; and to any interstate air pollution control agency whose jurisdictional area includes any such municipality, together with a notice specifying a reasonable time (not less than six months) to secure abatement of such pollution.

"(f) If such action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified in the notice following the public hearing is not taken, the Secretary—

"(1) in the case of air pollution which is endangering the health and welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, may request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution. The court shall receive in evidence in any such suit a transcript of the proceedings before the hearing board in such case and a copy of such board's recommendations and shall receive such further evidence as the court in its discretion deems proper. The court, giving due consideration to the practicability and to the physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved, shall have jurisdiction to enter such judgment, and orders enforcing such judgment, as the public interest and the equities of the case may require.

"(2) in the case of air pollution which is endangering the health or welfare of persons only in the State in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, shall send to the Governor and the attorney general of such State the findings and recommendations of the hearing board and his notice, together with a transcript of the hearing and his finding that action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution has not been taken, and at the request of such Governor or attorney general he shall provide such technical and other assistance as in his judgment is necessary to assist the State in judicial proceedings to secure abatement of the pollution under State or local law.

"(h) Members of any hearing board appointed pursuant to subsection (e) who are not regular full-time officers or employees of the United States shall, while participating in the hearing conducted by such board or otherwise engaged on the work of such board, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding \$100 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(i) In his summary of any conference pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall include references to any discharges allegedly contributing to pollution from any Federal property. Notice of any hearing pursuant to this section involving any pollution alleged to be affected by any such discharges shall also be given to the Federal agency having jurisdiction over the property involved and the findings and recommendations of the hearing board conducting such

hearing shall also include references to any such discharges which are contributing to the pollution found by such hearing board.

#### "REQUIREMENT OF REPORTS

"SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary is authorized to require any person whose activities result in the emission of air pollutants causing or contributing to air pollution which has been the subject of a conference under section 5 to file with him, in such form as he may prescribe, a report, furnishing to the Secretary such information as may reasonably be required as to the character, kind, and quantity of pollutants discharged and the use of devices or other means to prevent or reduce the emission of pollutants by the person filing such reports. Such report shall be made under oath or otherwise, as the Secretary may prescribe, and shall be filed with the Secretary within such reasonable period as the Secretary may prescribe, unless additional time be granted by the Secretary. All information in such report shall be considered confidential for the purposes of section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code.

"(b) If any person required to file any report under this section shall fail to do so within the time fixed by the Secretary for filing the same, and such failure shall continue for thirty days after notice of such default, such person shall forfeit to the United States the sum of \$100 for each and every day of the continuance of such failure, which forfeiture shall be payable into the Treasury of the United States, and shall be recoverable in a civil suit in the name of the United States brought in the district where such person has his principal office or in any district in which he does business: *Provided*, That the Secretary may upon application therefor remit or mitigate any forfeiture provided for under this subsection and he shall have authority to determine the facts upon all such applications.

"(c) It shall be the duty of the various United States attorneys, under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, to prosecute for the recovery of such forfeitures. The costs and expenses of such prosecution shall be paid out of the appropriation for the expenses of the courts of the United States.

#### "COOPERATION BY FEDERAL AGENCIES TO CONTROL AIR POLLUTION FROM FEDERAL FACILITIES

"SEC. 7. It is hereby declared to be the intent of Congress that any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over any building, installation, or other property shall, to the extent practicable and consistent with the interests of the United States and within any available appropriations, cooperate with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and with any air pollution control agency in preventing and controlling the pollution of the air in any area insofar as the discharge of any matter from or by such building, installation, or other property may cause or contribute to pollution of the air in such area.

#### "INFORMATION AVAILABLE TO PUBLIC

"SEC. 8. All research within the United States contracted for, sponsored, cosponsored, or authorized under authority of this Act shall be provided for in such manner that all information, uses, products, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from such research developed by Government expenditure will (with such exceptions and limitations, if any, as the Secretary may find to be necessary in the interest of national defense) be available to the general public. This subsection shall not be so construed as to deprive the owner of any background patent relating thereto of such rights as he may have thereunder.

#### "ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 9. (a) The Secretary is authorized to prescribe such regulations as are neces-

sary to carry out his functions under this Act. The Secretary may delegate to any officer or employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such of his powers and duties under this Act, except the making of regulations, as he may deem necessary or expedient.

"(b) Upon the request of an air pollution control agency, personnel of the Public Health Service may be detailed to such agency for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act. The provisions of section 214(d) of the Public Health Service Act shall be applicable with respect to any personnel so detailed to the same extent as if such personnel had been detailed under section 214(b) of that Act.

"(c) Payments under grants made under this Act may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary.

#### "DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 10. When used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(b) The term 'air pollution control agency' means any of the following:

"(1) A single State agency designated by the Governor of that State as the official State air pollution control agency for purposes of this Act;

"(2) An agency established by two or more States and having substantial powers or duties pertaining to the prevention and control of air pollution;

"(3) A city, county, or other local government health authority, or, in the case of any city, county, or other local government in which there is an agency other than the health authority charged with responsibility for enforcing ordinances or laws relating to the prevention and control of air pollution, such other agency; or

"(4) An agency of two or more municipalities located in the same State or in different States and having substantial powers or duties pertaining to the prevention and control of air pollution.

"(c) The term 'interstate air pollution control agency' means—

"(1) an air pollution control agency established by two or more States, or

"(2) an air pollution control agency of two or more municipalities located in different States.

"(d) The term 'State' means a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

"(e) The term 'person' includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, State, municipality, and political subdivision of a State.

"(f) The term 'municipality' means a city, town, borough, county, parish, district, or other public body created by or pursuant to State law.

#### "OTHER AUTHORITY NOT AFFECTED

"SEC. 11. This Act shall not be construed as superseding or limiting the authorities and responsibilities, under any other provision of the law, of the Secretary or any other Federal officer, department, or agency.

#### "SEPARABILITY

"SEC. 12. If any provision of this Act, or the application of any provision of this Act to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, and the remainder of this Act, shall not be affected thereby.

#### "SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 13. This Act may be cited as the 'Clean Air Act.'

SEC. 2. The title of such Act of July 14, 1955, is amended to read: "An Act to provide for air pollution prevention and control activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes".

## RETURN TO ONE-PRICE COTTON

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing two bills which would return us to a one-price cotton system. It is my hope the Agriculture Committee will consider both of these bills and report now one or the other or a combination of both.

The situation is urgent and even desperate. The cotton farmer is confused. He can never plan from one year to the next. The textile industry is faced with growing unemployment. It is unfair and almost criminal for our textile industry to be forced to pay 8½ cents per pound more for cotton than our foreign competitor.

Mr. Speaker, the American textile industry is the greatest friend of the American cotton farmer. The American textile industry purchases more than 70 percent of its cotton from the American cotton farmer. If the American textile industry and the American cotton farmer are to stay in business, something must be done now.

I represent a district where cotton is grown. My district also includes some of the most efficient cotton textile manufacturing plants in the world. I have a vital interest in the welfare of cotton farmers and the textile workers in my district. For more than 25 years I have watched the control program operate with respect to cotton. Each year, except during World War II and the Korean conflict, the situation with regard to the cotton industry has constantly deteriorated.

At the present time we are faced with a situation where, in my opinion, if something is not done rather quickly, we are on the threshold of liquidating this great industry. This will be a tremendous blow to not only the cotton farmers in some 20 States but it will mean unemployment for a large number of very highly skilled people who are engaged in the manufacture of cotton textiles.

My colleagues from the textile manufacturing areas know what has happened. We are allowing our competitors abroad an 8½-cent-per-pound advantage in price. This, coupled with the cheap labor supply, has allowed a flood of textiles to be imported into the United States. This is a very serious situation. Just as serious is the fact that many domestic users of cotton have changed to synthetics while the importation of foreign synthetic fiber is on the increase and thus the per capita consumption of cotton is going down, down, down. This is due primarily to price.

I believe that if we are going to maintain any semblance of a cotton industry we must reduce the Government-guaranteed price.

The bills I am introducing today are designed to move in a direction that will restore confidence in the cotton in-

dustry, increase the consumption of cotton both at home and abroad, lessen the drain on the Federal Treasury, and above all, improve and increase the net per family farm income of cotton producers.

## THE HONORABLE GRAHAM B. PURCELL, JR.

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a speech by the Vice President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, 1963, more than 1,200 citizens of the 13th District of Texas turned out at Wichita Falls to pay respects to their Congressman and our colleague, the Honorable GRAHAM PURCELL.

It was a great honor for me to participate in the recognition paid this outstanding Texan.

On this occasion, the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, was the principal speaker, and under unanimous consent I include herewith his timely remarks:

There is no place I am ever more willing to come—and no place I am more reluctant to leave—than Wichita Falls. I have been especially anxious to come here for this occasion tonight.

So long as I can remember Wichita Falls has been distinguishing itself in producing leadership for our State and Nation. There was a time back in the 1930's when nearly every major candidate for Governor—both Democrat and Republican—came from Wichita Falls. You gave Texas one of its very finest Governors—James V. Allred.

Through my service in Congress, this district was represented by some of the most able men ever to serve in Washington—my good friends, W. D. MacFarland, Ed Gossett, and Frank Ikard. While I might feel the less said about his party the better, you have now given Texas one of its U.S. Senators, a vigorous young member of the Republican Party, JOHN TOWER.

This is a distinguished record for Wichita Falls. Few other cities can equal it—and I am sure none have excelled it. That is why I am happy to come tonight to tell you—as I hope you already realize—that you have done yourselves proud once more by sending to the Congress of the United States the man we honor on this occasion, GRAHAM PURCELL.

Woodrow Wilson once said that one of two things happen to a man when he goes to Washington—he either grows or swells. In these last 12 months, GRAHAM PURCELL has grown.

If there has been any swelling, it is because he pulled a muscle playing football with that fine hometown backfield he and his wife are raising. In Washington, you see many types of men come and go. I remember the story of the new first-term Congressman who had just arrived in Washington and felt called upon to make a speech to his colleagues nearly every day. In speech after speech, he told the House that he would rather be right than President. One day the wise old Speaker, presiding over the Chamber, rapped his gavel and said: "The gentleman need not be so worried—he will never be either."

In his service as your Representative, GRAHAM PURCELL has not tried to be Com-

mander in Chief, Chief Justice, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and Budget Director—all rolled into one. He has been doing what you elected him to do: serving the people of this district, by serving the Nation every time the roll is called.

None of us will ever forget that great American, Sam Rayburn. Mr. Rayburn was a man of much wisdom and few words. The highest compliment he ever gave new Congressmen when he was convinced of their worth consisted of two words: "He'll do." If the gentleman from Bonham were with us tonight, I believe he would say of GRAHAM PURCELL: "He'll do."

Since he left home here a year ago, GRAHAM PURCELL—like all of us in Washington—has been both a witness to and a participant in the making of some of the most significant history of the century. While none of us can yet be sure of what the future holds, I believe that when the final judgment on our era is written, the year of 1962 will be remembered and pinpointed as one of the decisive turning points of the cold war and of the whole long struggle between freedom and tyranny.

In that year two events occurred which cannot be ignored or dismissed—and cannot be downgraded.

First, after 15 years of containment, the Russian Communists gambled desperately in an attempt to extend their armed empire across the oceans to the Western Hemisphere. They gambled greatly—and they lost.

Second, after that failure, the Russian Communists turned back to an empire in which—for the first time since communism came into existence—they found their own leadership and control defied and challenged by the Chinese Communists. And the whole myth of Communist unity exploded.

The finger of history rises slowly. Those who are witness to history's great movements often are unaware of the meaning of what their eyes behold. We may be unaware of the full import of the events which have transpired in recent months. But I like to recall the episode of history which Winston Churchill cited to us back in the dark days of 1950 when the Russian threat to Western Europe seemed so grave and the armed might of Communist aggressors seemed so irresistible.

Sir Winston pointed out that 500 years ago the West had been prostrate before the Mongol hordes advancing from the East. In two separate battles, which occurred on almost the same day in Poland and in Austria, the last remaining armies of western civilization were defeated and destroyed. Nothing stood in the way of the aggressors from the East.

But at that critical moment, the great Khan died. The Mongol armies turned back to travel 7,000 miles homeward to resolve their internal differences. And, as Sir Winston put it, "They never returned till now."

In the year of our Lord 1962, it was no chance of fate or accident of history that turned back the aggressors from the East. They found themselves facing the hard reality of an America ready, an America prepared, an America resolute. In the face of that preparedness and resolve, the forces of communism backed away. And today the two great powers of the Communist bloc are being drawn into a vicious and decisive struggle with each other.

Our need for vigilance has not ended. Our need for preparedness will not end during your lifetime or mine. America must continue to maintain its strength—and this we shall do. But there is one vital point which I believe needs to be brought home. The American strength which Khrushchev faced in Cuba—the strength which has held the line against aggression through all these years of the cold war—is not solely the strength of arms and planes and missiles and



bombs. The greater strength which has carried us through these years of peril is the strength of this country's political system—the system of which all of us are part and to which each of us adds or subtracts strength and solidarity.

Through the ages, every great civilization has made its contribution to the progress of man. The contribution of some have been philosophy or art or literature. The imprint which American civilization has left indelibly upon this century—and upon all centuries to come is political.

The genius of our system is described in many different ways by many different people. The businessman may say it is the profit motive. The working man may say it is the right to organize. The school man may say it is educational. The farmer may say it is agricultural. All these answers are right but none is complete.

The abiding genius of America is our ability, under the Constitution, to unite ourselves together to resolve our national problems, to face our common dangers, and to achieve through our efforts the greatest good for the greatest number.

The heart of this genius is the fact that the American people can and do rise above party and above the doctrine and dogma and division of partisanship, to unite in common devotion to principles which transcend the interests of parties, of class or region or race or religion.

This is a greater strength than we remember—a source of strength we too often forget. In the Communist-controlled countries—as in the Axis powers of the 1930's—the party is supreme and paramount. The people are exhorted to rally to the party, to give up their freedom, their possessions, and even their lives to the cause of party, not principles. Time will prove that this is the fatal defect of the totalitarian way.

I say this tonight for a reason. This is not a partisan occasion. If we are partisans at all, we are here as partisans of our friend and neighbor and faithful servant, GRAHAM PURCELL. But we are passing through a time in the history of our Republic when many voices counsel Americans that partisanship is the end-all and be-all of citizenship. This is counsel we should not heed.

In our national history, there are no heroes who made their names as partisans. The only men remembered—the only men worth remembering—have always been those who have placed the country above party and principle above partisanship. We shall have lost the keystone from the arch of our national strength if ever our values are otherwise.

There is much for Americans to be proud of, much for which we should be grateful. We live the freest lives of any peoples on earth. We enjoy the greatest abundance of any peoples who have ever lived. We are the least policed and least afraid of all God's children. At the heart of what we enjoy in this regard is the sense of individual responsibility.

In 1962, Americans paid more than \$90 billion in taxes to the Government. Of that huge total, 97 percent was self-assessed and voluntarily paid. In no other country—today or ever—has there been a comparable record. We build our schools; we care for the aged; we minister to the sick; we concern ourselves with the problems of our youth because of this inherent sense of individual responsibility. For the same reason and in the same way, we give of our resources so that other men and women half a world away may keep the freedom they want to keep for their children too.

The world is not ungrateful. The world is not unaware of what we do. Around this globe, nation after nation has adopted for itself constitutions modeled after the Constitution of the United States. Of the more than 50 new nations which have become in-

dependent during the years of the cold war, not one has chosen voluntarily to live under communism or to submit to Communist rule. That revolution of freedom that began on these shores 200 years ago continues to be the greatest and most compelling force in the world today—and it is a revolution which knows no partisanship, no dogma, and no partisan doctrine.

This political system which we have wrought is made stronger when the will of the people is represented by men like GRAHAM PURCELL. While GRAHAM PURCELL never forgets the principles of the party of which he is a member, he never remembers the party affiliation of a constituent he serves who enters his office with a worthy cause. This is what makes America strong—not arms alone, not factories alone, not fields alone.

The ultimate strength of America is the capacity of her people to unite together for common cause and higher purposes. And those who would have us divide ourselves along lines of partisanship and party subtract from our strength rather than add to it.

#### FEDERAL SPENDING

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, many taxpayers regard their tax payments as an onerous tribute exacted from them to keep Washington bureaucrats on the payroll. Since they get no merchandise back in return for their tax payments, they feel that they are getting nothing for their money. Accustomed as they are to seeing the shiny paint and chromium when they acquire a new car, or the fine fabric when they purchase a new garment, they somehow get the feeling that their tax dollars purchase nothing tangible or valuable for them.

It is the aim of this statement to inquire into the purposes for which our income tax money is spent, and the alternatives to such spending. Americans in and out of political life talk much about our determination to protect our precious freedoms and to resist the spread of government by dictatorship throughout the world. The question arises, however, as to whether we really hold these freedoms to be so precious that we are willing to pay for them with the hard cash of tax dollars. We must decide whether we are ready to invest in freedom and democracy with the sure knowledge that these twin blessings are not bought cheaply. To use a blunt expression, we must determine whether or not we are willing to put our money where our mouth is.

The principal misconception that must be cleared away is that our national budget is so astronomical because of all kinds of welfare programs in which the Government participates. The fact of the matter is that in fiscal 1963, out of every dollar which the taxpayer paid to his National Government, approximately 74 cents goes for national defense and security, space exploration, and the direct cost of our involvement in past wars. The entire remaining cost of Government

and its various domestic and international programs, departments, courts, and agencies comes from the 26 cents left over.

Our total budget in fiscal 1963 amounted to over \$94 billion. Out of this sum, almost \$50 billion was appropriated for the cost of our Armed Forces and our national defense. It should be emphasized, moreover, that these appropriations were made by the House of Representatives by a unanimous vote after unanimous recommendation of both the House Armed Services Committee and the House Appropriations Committee.

Thus, we see that military appropriations alone in fiscal 1963 came to 54 percent of our national budget, or 54 cents out of every tax dollar. Interestingly enough, some of those Congressmen who were most vocal in their support of these and other expenditures which will be dealt with hereafter are also the most vociferous in condemning the high level of Federal spending.

Congress in its foreign aid program for fiscal 1963 also allocated almost \$1½ billion exclusively for military assistance to help our allies protect themselves, and ultimately ourselves, against Communist expansion. This expense likewise was generally supported as a desirable alternative to sending additional American troops abroad at a much greater cost and at great hardship to many American families.

Do we remember the day Col. John Glenn successfully accomplished his historic mission into space? Can we recall how thrilled and proud we were to be an American when he and our other astronauts performed their fateful tasks so brilliantly? Well, in fiscal 1963, the U.S. Congress appropriated over \$3½ billion for space exploration. The vote in the House of Representatives was unanimous, and came upon the heels of the unanimous recommendations of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics and the House Appropriations Committee. This accounted for more than 3½ cents out of every tax dollar.

At this point it should be made clear that I do not suggest that there is not waste in defense or space expenditures. Constant vigilance and scrutiny by those responsible for the administration of such costs is indeed vitally needed. However, the figure of \$49,455,000 for military appropriations in 1963 was not picked out of the sky as an attractive round figure. It was arrived at after long and careful consideration and study by the committees of the House and Senate charged with the responsibility of providing for the national defense. Broken down item by item, it calls for a given amount for missiles, aircraft, naval vessels, operational training facilities, and so forth.

When the House Armed Services Committee after months of conscientious consultation with dedicated military personnel unanimously recommends that the sum of almost \$50 billion is required to make us impregnable and keep us at full strength, what Congressman can with responsibility call for across-the-

board slashes. To do so would be to engage in a perilous game of Russian roulette with our national security, and you can be sure that it would expose the dissenter to charges of "soft on communism" from the very persons who most loudly bewail our high Federal budget.

Nevertheless, we must realistically face the fact that until such time as we can make significant reductions in our spending for military and space programs, economies effected in other areas cannot be substantial enough in terms of the overall budget to have the desired impact on our national spending picture. Despite the fact that opponents of social welfare and international cooperation programs are trying to use the budget problem as an excuse to scuttle these programs, the ultimate fiscal solution lies in the field of defense and space appropriations which account for the lion's share of our great national cost.

Is it not strange that those who uncompromisingly support appropriations for military aircraft costing millions of dollars apiece will do battle against expenditures for the National Institutes of Health and its associated projects for health research? Yet it may indeed be true that the value of military and space equipment destroyed yearly in accidents alone exceeds our total expenditures for health research.

Returning once more to our list of military expenditures, our involvements in the wars that have plagued the 20th century have brought us face to face with the problem of veterans' benefits. Congress faced the issue in fiscal 1963 by appropriating about \$5½ billion for veterans' benefits, or over 5½ cents out of every tax dollar. This was accomplished without significant dissent after unanimous recommendation of the House Veterans Affairs Committee and the House Appropriations Committee.

We could, of course, eliminate or reduce the cost of veterans' benefits but to do so would involve turning our backs on those who suffered the most to protect our way of life. No one seriously suggests that this should be done. It would be a justifiably unpopular act to scale down our veterans' hospitals program or to take disability benefits away from those who are maimed or disabled by reason of serving their country. It is true that there may be some small percentage of cases of veterans who receive benefits to which they are not entirely entitled, but this again is a matter calling for careful administration rather than broadside budget cutting. To slash the appropriation for veterans' benefits because of a very limited number of abuses would be tantamount to throwing out the baby with the wash.

Let us now turn to the expenditure for interest on the national debt. In 1963 our annual interest payment on the national debt amounted to almost \$10 billion, or more than 10 cents out of every tax dollar. This is an expenditure which is roundly decried. However, it should be borne in mind that our national debt is overwhelmingly the result of the participation of the United States in World War II followed by the Korean war. The

national debt swelled from \$43 billion in 1940 to \$269 billion at the end of World War II.

During the dark years of World War II the U.S. Government was faced with the need to borrow money from the American people in order to finance the heroic war effort. Most of us recall the bond rallies at which the American people were exhorted to invest in Government bonds. Bright stars of the entertainment world sang, danced, and quipped in a patriotic endeavor to induce us to finance our struggle against our totalitarian enemies. Fortunately, the people responded, and they responded well.

We could have avoided the enormous financial expense of World War II by the very simple expedient of surrender. After the attack at Pearl Harbor, we might have ignominiously capitulated to the Japanese war lords. Likewise, we might have done business with Adolph Hitler. By so doing we would have held down our national debt. We also would have ceased to exist as a nation.

Had we as a nation failed to do what was necessary in 1941 to maintain our democratic system, we would have earned the scorn and calumny of future generations. In view of this, the argument that by our national indebtedness we are passing an intolerable burden along to our descendants has a hollow ring indeed.

What of the argument that we are spending our way into a welfare state? It can best be answered with the statistic that out of every tax dollar in fiscal 1963, only 7 to 9 cents was allocated to so-called welfare programs. The figure contracts or expands from 7 to 9 cents depending on your definition of the term "welfare." However, included among such programs are aid to aged and blind, medical research and hospital construction, the national scholarship and college aid system, school lunch programs, manpower retraining, and so forth. In 1939, 45 cents of the tax dollar, as contrasted with today's 7 to 9 cents, were allocated to labor and welfare programs.

Many persons ask why the Federal Government cannot live within its means like State and local governments. As a matter of fact, if State and local governments did not have the advantage of Federal grants paid for out of the National Treasury, their burdens would be insupportable. Your U.S. Government could probably balance the budget tomorrow if it withdrew the prop of Federal money from the various State and local governments.

Whisking along a wide four-lane highway, we should consider that we would very likely be poking along a narrow, choked road from congested city to congested city if the U.S. Government had not paid 90 percent of the cost. Stop to think what it would cost local governments too if the Federal Treasury did not foot a great part of the bill for relief, hospital construction, and many other purely local necessities.

We constantly read in the press editorials charging that legislators support spending programs to perpetuate themselves in office. As a matter of fact, how-

ever, it is not true that all spending programs are popular and that Congressmen support them for political advantage. On the contrary, it often takes more political courage for a Congressman to support than to oppose some spending measures which are not widely in demand, but which he believes to be in the national interest. Consider, for instance, the issues of foreign aid and the purchase of United Nations bonds.

Actually, our tax payments represent an investment in liberty. Liberty being a concept, it cannot be seen or measured or weighed. How much freedom makes a pound? But talk to any American who has been in a dictator-ridden country and has come back home. He will tell you that liberty can surely be felt. And when you make an investment in that bright commodity, believe me you are getting a lot for your money.

I do not suggest that governmental economies are not possible. Of course, the Congress has the responsibility of seeing that the peoples' money is not wasted by maladministration or by top-heavy payrolls. This responsibility is all the more heightened by the dimensions of our expansive programs. However, we should not deny or begrudge our own Government the just cost of our sizable and complicated operations. Any person who receives the benefits of orderly democratic processes under freedom is immature and unreasonable if not willing to help his Government support such processes financially.

I once heard a man say: "Living is a waste of money. I can't afford it." Let us not as Americans say the same thing about democracy.

#### MORE WASTE IN DEFENSE SPENDING

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Mandrake, the magician, had nothing on the Navy Department's procurement experts. Believe it or not, Navy now has a procurement underway which requires a manufacturer to make an item before he can bid on it, but he cannot get the drawings he needs to meet this requirement.

The end result, unless this purchase is stopped and revised, will be that a favored company will get the contract, some Navy employee or employees will get an evening's or an afternoon's entertainment, and the taxpayer will get it in the neck again.

Once you wade through a maze of boilerplate documents the details are simple. They add up to another before-the-fact disclosure of the capriciousness and irresponsibility of middle-grade servants. They point to a serious error which must be immediately corrected.

Last June 26 the Navy signed a contract with General Atronics Corp., of Philadelphia. It covered development



of an oscilloscope, a device which visually measures changes in a varying current. Development, drawings, and services totaled \$49,415 under terms of this contract—NObsr 87573. Production was also generated under another contract for production of the oscilloscope, called the USM-117, and this contract cost the taxpayer \$107,325.

After spending \$150,000 for development and first production, the Navy decided it needs 927 more of these devices. This time the requirement was put out for competitive bidding, only Navy purchasing officials rigged the rules to keep all other firms out of the action.

Currently scheduled to close May 1, 1963, is Navy invitation to bid 600-481-63. Under terms of this document all manufacturers who want to bid are first required to make a sample unit and have it approved by Navy. This will cost a manufacturer about \$25,000, with no guarantee of getting the contract, but several manufacturers are interested even on these terms. The problem is that they cannot get the plans to build the equipment. This purchase is under the supervision of Navy purchasing office chief, Capt. C. A. Appleby, contract negotiator, C. Lear—telephone Oxford 6-6696—and engineer, Raymond Usilton—telephone Oxford 6-2010. These men have issued an invitation which stipulates that microfilms of manufacturing drawings will be issued to a contractor only after the award of contract. This provision is on page 14 of IFB 600-481-63-S.

In other words, a manufacturer must make the equipment and have it approved by the Navy before he can even be considered in the bidding. However, the same man cannot get the necessary drawings until he has won the contract, and he cannot build the set until he gets the drawings.

It is very plain to see that the stage has been set for a contract award to a company which already has the drawings and the only firm that has them—the company that developed the set and produced it first on a sole-source basis.

In short, Mr. Speaker, you just cannot get from here to there, and all this is because of the capricious and irresponsible action of Mr. Usilton, Mr. Lear, and Captain Appleby. There is absolutely nothing fair about this sort of conduct, and as a representative of American taxpayers, I protest vigorously. I also want to remind the Secretary of Defense that this sort of conduct is in direct conflict with his freedom of information policy issued last December which was supposed to aid manufacturers in getting every paper they needed to do business with Uncle Sam.

What should be done right now is to make these manufacturing drawings available to anyone who wants them for the cost of reproduction. The requirement to build a set before you can bid on it should be removed and this procurement should be made 100 percent competitive. If this is done, we will get a truly competitive procurement, provided some other bureaucrat does not change the rules again. If Navy continues to hide the drawings, it will again

demonstrate its inefficiency and incompetency in handling public moneys.

I say today that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy should put the drawings for this oscilloscope out on the counter, make this a truly competitive procurement, and let American industry go to work. I have great confidence in the results.

#### LEGALIZING A NATIONAL LOTTERY

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, to those Members of Congress who react with shocked feelings at the mere thought of legalizing a national lottery, I would like to bring to their attention some interesting facts which prove that tens of millions of our American citizens enjoy the relaxation and pleasures of gambling.

The National Association of State Racing Commissioners has just released its 1962 report on horse racing in the United States. It shows that \$3,669,463,825 was wagered in 24 States where gambling on horses is legal and proper—at least inside the gates. I might point out that this figure represents an increase of over \$202 million from last year.

The interesting part of this report, Mr. Speaker, is the tax revenue to the 24 States—collected painlessly and voluntarily—amounted to almost \$288 million. This also is an increase of over \$23 million over last year.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of our sanctimonious attitude about gambling, our Federal Treasury was the recipient of additional millions of dollars in taxes collected on admission charges from 50,582,092 persons whose urge to gamble brought them through the turnstiles.

To those who look upon gambling as wicked and immoral, I would like to point out to them that gambling funds collected in all 24 States are commingled with other State revenues and used to build schools and teach our children. As a matter of fact, the State of Florida last year programed nine extra racing days which were allotted for scholarships and charities.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for the average American taxpayer to understand why all the resistance to a National Lottery when every day millions of dollars change hands at every stock exchange, at every race track, at just about every sporting event that is staged. Are these transactions any different than buying a lottery ticket? Are these activities any different than the lotteries conducted every month by thousands of civic and fraternal clubs, churches, and welfare organizations where automobiles, television sets, and other prizes are raffled off to the lucky ticket holder?

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come for this Congress to stop pussyfooting. I think the time has come for this Congress to wipe out

hypocrisy and recognize the indisputable fact that man, by his very nature, is a gambler and wants a chance to legally satisfy his gambling thirst.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come for this Congress to realize that a national lottery is the only painless, sensible, and voluntary way to raise over \$10 billion a year in additional revenue which can be used to reduce our national debt and cut the heavy tax burden carried by our American wage earners.

#### THE WASHINGTON POST AND THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, today's editorial in the Washington Post entitled "Seeing Reds" once again reflects an illogical and unreasonable prejudice against the important work and objectives of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. For a paper that repeatedly claims to pride itself on a claimed objectivity of approach to important national issues, it seems to me that the Post does the public a disservice in repeatedly so editorializing as to slant facts against this Committee.

For example, "Seeing Reds" finds the Post repeating the well-worn strawman that we do not need the House Un-American Activities Committee because we have an FBI. This is ridiculous as the Post well knows. Why? Because, first, while the FBI is a splendid, efficient, and effective organization, the limited number of FBI agents—approximately 6,000—are required to do a great deal in the way of criminal and security investigation entirely unrelated to subversion; only a very small number of agents are available at any one time for subversive detail; but, second, even if detailed to subversive investigation, or surveillance, the FBI is an investigating agency lacking, completely, the power to compel testimony under oath. In the investigation of subversion it is indispensable that the activities of Communists should be developed by a process that compels answers under oath to relevant questions that are subject to penalties of perjury and wherein refusal to answer is punishable by contempt; otherwise there just would be little reliable information; third, in the important mission of keeping abreast of subversion within the United States the work of the FBI, House Un-American Activities Committee, and the Internal Security Subcommittee of Senate Judiciary are complementary, not opposed. They can and do work toward the single desirable objective, the safety and security of the American people.

It is unfortunate that the Post should continue to minimize or misrepresent the fundamental importance of the House Un-American Activities Commit-

tee and its continuation because of occasional differences of opinion as to method or application in individual cases. The committee is composed of sincere and loyal men who do not conceive themselves as superior in loyalty to other Americans but who are deeply concerned that there can be some who call themselves Americans who either profess membership in the Communist Party or knowingly and intentionally give aid and comfort to Communist Party objectives in this country. When we consider that the No. 1 objective of communism is the destruction of this Nation, the killing of its Government, its judges, and its leadership, it becomes reasonably obvious that Communist activity in the United States demands continuing investigation.

The tremendous bipartisan endorsement of this House of the continuation of its Un-American Activities Committee reflects the overwhelming support of the American people in which I am glad to say I join.

#### U.N. AID TO CUBA

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in my first statement to this House last month concerning the workings of the United Nations Special Fund, I said that an investigation was continuing into U.N. aid going to Cuba from sources other than the Special Fund.

Today, I will outline a number of U.N. aid projects being conducted in Communist Cuba with the subsidization of American taxpayers. These are over and beyond the \$1.2 million Special Fund project for Cuban agriculture, and the Special Fund project for nuclear research in Red Yugoslavia.

Cuba has been receiving U.N. assistance under the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance since the 1950's. In programs scheduled in the 1961 to 1964 period Cuba has continued to receive U.N. aid, and currently—1962 to 1963—some \$1,033,080 is being spent by the U.N. in its efforts of technical assistance designed to strengthen Cuba.

This aid is administered by five sub-organizations of the U.N.—International Labor Organization, Food and Agriculture Organization, United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, International Civil Aviation Organization, and World Health Organization.

All of these organizations have high, altruistic aims and goals in the service of mankind. We Americans, certainly, agree with their general work. But once again, in the case of Cuba, American taxpayers who keep the U.N. solvent are being put in the position of paying to strengthen a Communist, enemy nation.

It is my purpose here today to provide for the House additional details about

these projects so that Americans can be made aware of what they are paying for under the U.N. Americans may wish to continue to support some of the humanitarian programs listed here. On the other hand, they might prefer to curtail our support of others.

I already have addressed the House about the International Civil Aviation Organization program for training Cubans in aircraft operations and maintenance—a \$17,280 project.

Here are the other U.N. aid projects for Cuba:

##### 1. INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

The ILO is conducting in Cuba a \$69,000 project concerning social security. This project has been underway since the pre-Castro days of 1955, but has been continued to the Communist dictator's benefit.

It is planned that in 1963 at least three ILO experts will be in Cuba to further this project. In previous years two experts have been provided.

The project is designed in the words of the United Nations to "overcome a situation which might cause serious economic and social repercussions." It involves a study and recommendations about actuarial difficulties involved in a number of pension funds operated in Cuba with a view to combining some of the funds.

The project includes a "review of the policy of social security in the country as a whole."

That leads one to wonder if social security benefits are being paid to the widows and orphans of the men murdered by Castro firing squads.

##### 2. FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION

The FAO is conducting a continuing project in Cuba programed in the 1963 to 1964 financial year for \$160,000 and for increasing amounts until 1968. The project is entitled "Fisheries Development."

Main objectives of this project, the U.N. says, are to develop Cuba's fishery resources along the Continental Shelf and on the high seas. To do this the U.N. plans to help Cuba improve its fishing fleet, explore fisheries and study fish biology and inland water restocking possibilities.

The U.N. says that among its objectives is one to "facilitate the Government's shipbuilding and marine investigation projects."

It may occur to some Americans that shipbuilding is a necessary adjunct for the conducting of guerrilla operations in Latin America.

Also the FAO, subsidized by American dollars, is helping Cuba in its "general economic development and food supply plans." FAO is providing experts to assist the Cuban Fishing Research Center of the Fishing Department of the National Institute of Agrarian Reform.

Castro's Communist agrarian reform movement is well known in this House of Representatives.

##### 3. UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

UNESCO is conducting two projects in Cuba at this time.

The first is entitled "Educational Services" and is costing the U.N. and its American supporters \$13,500. Under this program, the U.N. says, an expert will cooperate with the Cuban Higher Institute of Education in preparing curricula and textbooks, organizing courses, and planning research.

This work is being done in connection with Castro's educational reorganization program, which, if it is at all like his other reorganizations, is being reorganized to teach children to parrot the Red line.

The second UNESCO project in Cuba is entitled "Marine Biology" and provides for \$54,000 for work in close conjunction with the FAO fisheries project in Cuba discussed above. Why two U.N. organizations are conducting the same project with separate funds has not been explained by the U.N.

This UNESCO project also is planned for continuation through 1968.

##### 4. WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

The WHO, U.N. organization with which I am well acquainted as a doctor and as a Member of Congress who attended as an adviser of this House the WHO meeting in Geneva last year, has a number of projects underway in Cuba. The chief one is entitled "Public Health Administration" and is programed for a current cost of \$152,000.

Essentially, it is designed to investigate the human resources and physical health facilities of Cuba and to train technical and auxiliary staffs in the fields of public health. It is proposed, the U.N. says, that the program will "progressively cover the whole territory of the Republic of Cuba, in a network of protection, promotion, and rehabilitation of the health of inhabitants." The plan will last for 10 years or more.

There are several other WHO projects in Cuba, all designed to improve the health of the unfortunate people enslaved on that Red island—a goal with which few Americans will find fault. These projects include:

First. A drive to eradicate the yellow fever mosquito from the Havana area at a 1963-64 cost of \$143,000. It is planned that the area involved will be expanded in later years. Staffs include a medical officer and two sanitarians.

Second. A project in nursing education features a school of nursing adapted to Cuba's needs and opened in October, 1960, with 94 students. By 1962 the school had 100 students and trained them at 400-bed National Hospital. In addition a special 6-month course for preparation of nursing instructors is given in Cuba.

Third. A malaria eradication project under the WHO general budget lists expenses for 1963 to 1964 of \$170,000. It involves a survey of the malarious area of Cuba, including Oriente and Camaguey Provinces, and the area around the U.S. base at Guantanamo. Provision is made for a malariologist, a sanitary engineer, two sanitarians, and an entomologist.

Fourth. A program for fellowships in public health training under the WHO



and the Pan American Health Organization is slated to cost \$254,300 for the 1963 to 1964 period. These fellows are to collaborate with the government in training staff for improvement and expansion of its public health services.

Fifth. A final Cuban project undertaken by the United Nations World

Health Organization is entitled "Refuse Disposal" and provides for a consultant to advise Cuba in establishing facilities for proper disposal of refuse from Havana and adjacent areas. Fellowships were provided under this plan in 1962.

*Supplemental United Nations aid projects in Cuba, 1963-64 financial year*

Project title	Supervisory agency	Cost estimate
Social security.....	International Labor Organization.....	\$69,000
Fisheries development.....	Food and Agriculture Organization.....	160,000
Educational services.....	UNESCO.....	13,500
Marine biology.....	UNESCO.....	54,000
Public health administration.....	World Health Organization.....	152,000
Yellow fever eradication.....	do.....	143,000
Nursing education.....	do.....	(1)
Malaria eradication.....	do.....	170,000
Public health training fellowship.....	do.....	254,300
Havana refuse disposal.....	do.....	(1)
Air operations training.....	International Civil Aviation Organization.....	17,280
Total costs available.....		1,033,080

<sup>1</sup> Unavailable.

### THE CRISIS OF CREDIBILITY

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the effectiveness of any democratic government depends to a great degree on whether or not the people believe that the government is dealing with them in a forthright manner. This is entirely as it should be, for this is a government of the people.

As Americans the significance to us of this realism is not confined to our 50 States alone. The actions of our Government and the statements of our leaders are as meaningful in Karachi and Rome as they are in Kalamazoo and Sacramento. Without seeking it we have come to a position of world influence and we find that millions of people the world over look to us hopefully not only for bread and encouragement but for what they, as nations, desperately seek most of all: their national integrity and the right to develop national self-determination.

In the 50 States and in all non-Communist nations, U.S. leadership is essential: our diplomatic stance must build confidence, our military position must be convincing, our dollar must have the solidity of a rock, and our pronouncements must carry the weight of reliability.

In the years leading to 1961 our Government carefully constructed the kind of reliable stance demanded under the trying conditions of postwar reconstruction and the search for national and world tranquillity. Whether one agrees or disagrees with every action taken by the Truman administration or by the Eisenhower administration, the U.S. Government had been forthright with our own people and with the world in these important years.

Statements of our Presidential leadership accurately reflected our intent, and actions supported the statements. The most basic requirement of moral leader-

ship was met. People everywhere believed what the U.S. Government said.

Since 1961 we have stumbled and fallen, losing concern for reliability. Our present leadership, taking maximum advantage of the reputation previously acquired, has demonstrated more faith in the superficial impressions of what it says rather than in the basic meaning of what it does. As a result we as a people and our friends abroad are coming to view with suspicion what used to be a responsible Government concern for truth. Official statements no longer carry the weight of reliability. We now face a crisis of credibility.

To what do we owe this condition? How can it be that a credibility of such sound foundation could be undermined and cast in doubt in a relatively brief period? Our people, and those the world over, are fairminded and sound thinkers in matters of this kind. We should not conclude that loss of credibility results from one, two, or even a few incidents. People reach judgments on the basis of what they see over a period of time; on a trend rather than on a single piece of evidence. Perhaps it will serve us well if we examine some events which may have contributed to the trend.

A recent event of significance is the statement of Mr. Kennedy, February 14, regarding the plan of the United Nations Special Fund to spend \$1.1 million on an agricultural project in Cuba. Mr. Kennedy said:

There are not any U.S. dollars that will go into that program.

Americans and our friends abroad are unconvinced. They know the United States provides 40 percent of the money used by the United Nations Special Fund, and that the money loses its identity when utilized. They have a right to ask if the Kennedy statement is based simply on a U.N. bookkeeping exercise designed to camouflage the actual manner in which U.S. taxpayers' money is put to use.

Our people have a right to ask if the United Nations itself has not lost a great deal in this kind of incident, since the U.N. can be effective only to the degree that people believe in its purposes and

methods. The Kennedy attempt to obscure the facts of the Cuban agriculture project does a real disservice to the United Nations itself.

It is another chapter in the unfortunate story which began with the U.S. involvement in the Congo, an affair about which misleading statements rather than accurate information served to becloud and confuse, thereby creating doubt and despair. In what was evidently a move to justify the Kennedy support for military action against Katanga, the President and his associates made a substantial effort to discredit the Katanga government.

On September 27, 1961, Assistant Secretary of State Carl T. Rowan said the Katanga lobby was conducting a clever big-money campaign in the United States through the Katanga Information Service.

Mr. Kennedy should now deny or confirm that Justice Department files show that while Katanga operated on an information budget of about \$100,000 annually, the central Congo Government spent \$219,552 for this purpose in 1962. The Adoula government evidently more than doubled Katanga's expenditures and did it through two different public relations agencies in New York, one of which operated on a monthly retainer of \$2,000. This effort was designed to reshape American opinion toward the Congo so as to accord with Kennedy policy. Americans rightly want to know by what standards the Kennedys judged the two groups.

The substantial loss of credibility suffered by the Kennedy administration in recent months is related also to the policy of managed news.

Managed news is the control of public information either by outright falsification of the facts, controlled public interpretation of the meaning of events, deliberate stoppage of the release of undesirable news, or the actual manufacturing of desirable news. Kennedy people have demonstrated their readiness to practice all these arts, and have advanced the practice to a precise skill.

Of course this phenomenon is not new. The most ancient of governments found that their people could be controlled if public information could be controlled. The esteemed editor of the Hartford Courant, Mr. Herbert Brucker, wrote in 1949 in his book "Freedom of Information":

What the people of a democracy must know, whether in war or in peace, is not what official opinion holds good for them to know, but what has happened. If something has happened, or has been said in important places, or has been decided on, the people have an inalienable right to know it.

In contrast with that, Mr. Kennedy and his administration have embarked on a policy which sets themselves up as the judges of what the people are to know. Mr. Kennedy said in a press conference that he wished to clear up the controversy over public information "so that there is a free flow of the news to which the press is entitled and which I think ought to be in the press." Clearly he feels himself to be the judge of what the people should know.

Responsible newspapermen, and all of our people, find this to be an idea foreign to our concept of democratic government. Mr. Kennedy's actions to assume a controlling influence over the Nation's news media is viewed with extreme seriousness.

In time of war or extreme national peril, the United States has always granted a degree of news management to its leadership. This is commonsense. And if this is what Mr. Kennedy has in mind, we would feel little concern. But the evidence is to the contrary. Mr. Richard Wilson, long respected and able Washington newsman wrote recently: "For many months the President and his associates have been instructing the press on what it publishes right and what it publishes wrong."

Mr. Wilson lists several examples of outright falsehoods perpetrated by Mr. Kennedy on the people. They range from the story that the Kennedy-Khrushchev discussions in Vienna were conducted in a friendly atmosphere to the inaccuracies regarding the military buildup in Cuba.

I want to commend and give my support to this body's special Subcommittee on Government Information and its chairman, the gentleman from California, Congressman JOHN MOSS. The subcommittee has been engaged in highly useful and constructive work, and its objectives take on even more importance now as the Nation is faced with intense and skillful news management by the Kennedy administration.

The gentleman from California, Congressman MOSS, was right when he said in San Francisco last November 30 that President Kennedy has taken firm control of the management of Government news in a manner that is unprecedented and unique in peacetime. He said important newsmaking events are under firm Presidential control, and he rightly called for a broad public discussion.

The subcommittee's current examination of news management will have the support of the entire country and in fact has already been commended in responsible newspapers around the country, including the St. Paul, Minn., Dispatch, in its lead editorial February 9.

We are not justified in feeling that the managed news policy of the Kennedys is an accident. Assistant Defense Secretary Arthur Sylvester said in New York December 6 that news generated by the Government is considered as a weapon.

He said the Government has an inherent right to lie. He added:

If any of us are virtuous 51 percent of the time in life, it's a good record and in politics an amazing record.

In my opinion, this tells us a lot about the Kennedy administration.

The distinguished New York Times newsman, Mr. Arthur Krock, elaborated in his Fortune magazine article where he said the Kennedys are managing the news with a cynicism, boldness, and subtlety unmatched in peacetime history.

He said news management has been used to inflate success or to gloss over error. Mr. Kennedy himself was pictured as the most brilliant operator of

the subtle, indirect method of administration news management.

In recent days, various Kennedy spokesmen have spoken of what they term irresponsible Republican criticisms which they say threaten the national interest. They have said that Republicans offer no alternative policies to Kennedy policies they oppose. These contentions deserve comment.

The American people and people all over the world recall vividly the reckless charges of John Kennedy in the 1960 election campaign that our country had fallen way behind in the production of missiles. These charges, repeated over and over, were echoed throughout the world and served to cast a heavy pall of concern for the ability of this country to defend itself and to defend friendly nations against an aggressive enemy. The irresponsibility of the missile gap charges was unprecedented and of grave consequence. The inaccuracies were so pronounced that they had to be counteracted very shortly after Mr. Kennedy's inauguration. The Secretary of Defense was put in the uncomfortable position of having to set the record straight in order to try to undo some of the damage that had been recklessly done to the national interest. In this light the recent politically motivated accusations of Kennedy spokesmen are exposed as simply extensions of the Kennedy management of public information.

Examination of the attacks by Republicans on the Kennedy foreign policy will show that they are responsible and constructive comments on matters which are of legitimate concern to us all. For example, revelations of Communist military strength on the island of Cuba have been substantiated. Even the newest estimates by administration critics have not been convincingly contradicted. On the contrary, they have stimulated the Kennedy administration to provide more information relating to the military buildup than it had released previously. A troubled American Nation does not call this irresponsibility. We have witnessed one falsehood after another regarding Cuba, each one serving to lessen our faith in our leadership. Even the loss of four young American men at the Bay of Pigs was concealed until discovered by those who, Mr. Kennedy would have us believe, are irresponsible.

There are two main concerns regarding Cuba today. The first is the real extent of the Communist military buildup, and how we can best learn about it in the face of Mr. Kennedy's avowed policy to provide the news only as he sees fit. The second is just as important: What is the meaning that we give to the buildup in terms of our national interest and in terms of the interests of the Western Hemisphere? To what degree is Cuba being used as a base for the terrorist and revolutionary activities we see growing elsewhere in Latin America?

It is these points which are the concern of the American people and of the administration's critics. Republican comments are directed at stimulating a meaningful dialog on these issues of national policy, and the attempts to call this irresponsible fall on ears which have been deafened by the cries of the missile gap.

We must also consider the matter of Republican alternatives. It speaks well for the effectiveness of Kennedy news management that administration spokesmen have made considerable progress in their attempts to portray Republicans as offering blind obstruction, without providing alternatives.

The truth is that Republicans have offered constructive and workable alternatives to virtually all major legislative program which they oppose. They provide responsible opposition. And further, Mr. Kennedy and his associates have sometimes grasped these Republican ideas and implemented them and claimed them as their own. The Manpower Retraining Act of the 87th Congress, termed a great Democrat success by the Kennedy people, is basically the Republican program. It is the result of hard, progressive, constructive work by the gentleman from New York, Congressman CHARLES GOODELL, and many other Republicans.

Mr. Kennedy's action in October 1962 setting up a partial blockade of Cuba was a Republican proposal advanced 13 months earlier. Several Republican Members of Congress, myself included, in September 1961 proposed a peaceful search and seizure program to prevent further Communist military equipment from reaching Cuba. Had our idea been accepted earlier, there would have been no need to go to the brink last fall. During most of 1962 Republicans who originated and presented this alternative were on one hand accused of presenting no alternatives, and on the other were accused of irresponsible and trigger-happy moves right up to the very hour, literally speaking, at which Mr. Kennedy said that he would take the action we recommended. We only regret that Mr. Kennedy has not fully implemented his announced intentions in that October 22 speech. We respectfully ask that he do so.

Our people are coming to learn more of the Republican alternatives. The Republican education proposal, for example, holds promise of making real progress toward providing meaningful Federal Government assistance to those school districts where the need is the greatest. The Republican proposal for providing additional opportunity for voluntary Federal help to senior citizens in obtaining medical and hospital care is also a program of real potential. As more and more citizens learn of these constructive Republican programs, it becomes easier for people to see the concern of our party for national progress. The political public relations gimmicks of the Kennedys stand exposed.

It is in the area of civil rights that we should pay special attention. We have all heard eloquent words from the Kennedy people of the need for effective action to extend full citizenship rights and responsibilities to all Americans. I call attention to the civil rights proposal advanced in this session of the Congress by myself and other Republican members of the Judiciary Committee. We think it is a constructive proposal which merits serious consideration. We welcome and suggest a full comparison with the well-publicized but superficial



Kennedy proposal of February 28. The inadequate Kennedy message is a retreat from progress because it invites defeat of any truly meaningful civil rights legislation in the 88th Congress.

However much Mr. Kennedy's loss of credibility has impaired his leadership in matters of importance within our own borders, the same phenomenon reaches most serious consequences in terms of the free world alliances. Here we have heard from Mr. Kennedy himself that bold American leadership is needed. But we are faced with a serious deterioration in our international position. Presidents Truman and Eisenhower steadily, patiently, and effectively constructed a system of alliances of substantial meaning. They built a reliability for our country, and convinced friend and foe alike of our determination to stand firm in defense of our principles.

Today the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is faltering to the point of crisis. France has rejected all pretense of cooperation and is saying openly that we cannot be relied upon; England has taken two serious blows in succession, first from this country and then from France. The source of greatest influence toward reconciliation is now West Germany, not the United States. The SEATO pact has become meaningless and our good friends in Pakistan are having to review their trust in our country. The Alliance for Progress is in deep trouble, and we are soon to be treated to the spectacle of lively anti-American sentiment from what should be the least likely source, Canada.

The integrity of the American dollar is a major part of this country's claim to leadership. But even here, the Kennedy loss of credibility has had serious consequences both at home and abroad. Mr. Kennedy's budget estimate for fiscal year 1963 was first stated as a small surplus of about \$400 million. But that goal is grossly impossible, and a deficit in excess of \$8 billion is expected.

Mr. Kennedy, in his efforts to convince us that any national problem can be solved through expanded government activity, attempts to show that anyone with other ideas is opposed to progress. Reliance on the individual, the family, and on local and State government is thus strangely equated with objection to the public interest. This further harms the Kennedy credibility.

The Government's spending on non-essential programs is growing so fast as to alarm all responsible people. Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, for example, says the "crime of national insolvency" callously and mercilessly burdens the livelihood and earnings of future generations with a tremendous, oppressive national debt." In this body our esteemed chairman of the Appropriations Committee refers to the newest Kennedy budget as being nothing like he has ever seen in 40 years. He reminds us that it is a recordbreaker, that it proposes spending in an amount \$500 million more than we spent in the peak year of World War II when survival was the sole object, and that much of this huge amount is for nondefense purposes.

Last year Mr. Kennedy said he would propose a balanced budget for fiscal year

1964. But despite that statement, and even though national revenues are expected to be at a record high level in the new fiscal year, Mr. Kennedy is now proposing a budget deficit of \$11.9 billion, which is clearly a tentative and precarious estimate only. The final actual deficit will be considerably greater. The effect is frightening, to us and to our friends abroad. It is small wonder that our allies hesitate to rely on us.

Mr. Kennedy's credibility has not been enhanced by his current tax proposals. He presented his tax message as tax reduction and reform. But in fact it has been shown that some taxpayers would actually find their tax liability increased under the Kennedy plan. And what he called reform has been shown to be simply alteration of the present morass of tax regulations. The noted economic columnist, J. A. Livingston, writes that the proposed alterations would enable the Government to take with one hand what it yields with the other. "It makes neither good sense nor suits the normal standards of logic or equity," he says.

Perhaps the most telling blow of all to the credibility of the Kennedy administration has been struck on this issue of taxes. Mr. Kennedy's inaugural speech was noted for its eloquent passage, "Ask not what the country can do for you, but what you can do for your country." This idea touched all of us for its simple expression of the national interest.

But soon after the Kennedy tax message of January 24, 1963, began to stir an undercurrent of discontent, Mr. Walter Heller, Chairman of the Kennedy Council of Economic Advisers, said he was surprised to see these objections. He laid it to a Puritan ethic in our people. This was the only reason he could see that would cause people to object to reductions in their own taxes.

It appears that despite the noble sentiments of inauguration day the Kennedy people do not really believe people are motivated by concern for the national interest. They believe the people are motivated by selfish interests, and that a proposal for reduced taxes would automatically be received with great favor by the voters because it would appeal to these selfish interests.

My opinion is that Americans today feel a great concern indeed for the national interest. They do not ask for reduced taxes if it means greatly increased budget deficits. The letters coming from constituents demonstrate this. Our people want to eliminate nonessential Government spending; they want a balanced budget in times of relative peace and national economic health; and they want a tax structure designed to stimulate, not discourage, the proper exercise of individual economic incentive. They want a government as servant of the people, not a people as servant of the government.

Most important, our people want credibility in their leaders. It is not only desirable, but essential, that we as a nation work to restore our Government standards to the high level of veracity and integrity expected by our people and by the world.

The present crisis of credibility can and must be overcome so that the United States will reestablish its rightful position as diplomatic, military, economic, and moral leader of the free world.

#### RECOGNITION BY LAW OF ORGANIZATIONS OF POSTAL AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of my colleagues to a bill which I have this day introduced providing for recognition by law of organizations of postal and Federal employees.

This bill is similar to my previous bill in the 87th Congress, H.R. 4078, and, if approved, it would not only provide recognition for Federal employee unions, but it would also specify procedures for the adjustment of grievances.

It is highly appropriate that this legislation should be presented today because of the fact that employee organizations are in the process of signing, today, a contract under the terms of Executive Order 10988 which enables the Federal Government to recognize employee organizations in a fashion similar to that which would be accomplished were my bill to be enacted into law.

My bill is submitted for introduction notwithstanding the fact that contracts are now being signed, and the bill is presented because of two things:

First. In my opinion the matter at hand is of such significance that it should be on the statute books, rather than remain subject to amendment by a Chief Executive who may be less favorably inclined toward the responsibilities and prerogatives of Federal employee organizations than is the present incumbent in the White House.

Second. The omission from the contract of any provision for an orderly promotion procedure in the Post Office Department seems to me to allow chaos to be continued in the postal service, where the largest number of rank and file Federal employees is concentrated.

In view of the fact that the contract is just now being signed, we in Congress cannot have yet any way of knowing precisely what is included in that document.

However, the contract covering the postal service will apply to a larger number of employees than perhaps any single industrial union contract currently extant.

My act of introducing appropriate legislation is intended to portray my deep and abiding awareness of the need to solemnize by law, the marriage between Government, as employer, and the organizations which represent the various groups of employees.

In spite of the lack of current access to the exact terms of the contract, I have been advised by employee leaders of the omission of a promotion program as has already been indicated.

Another very salient point in my estimation is the fact that the contract does not provide for disposal of the infamous stopwatch system which was initiated in the Postal Service by the previous administration, and which has a surface appeal to those legislators and the fiscal watchdogs of the executive department who have been persuaded to believe that an elaborate array of production statistics may be a valid substitute for true efficiency and high employee morale.

I have introduced separate legislation to correct that condition. However, the topic of stopwatches is pertinent to the matter of labor-management relations because the Post Office Department has maintained that its administration of the work measurement system is not a topic of negotiable character. Consequently, I understand there will be nothing on work measurement appearing in the contract.

Because of considerations such as these and because of my deep concern for the dignity of postal employees wherever they may be assigned, I decided, Mr. Speaker, to reintroduce my legislation concerning recognition of employee organizations.

I hope that consideration may be early and swift.

#### FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS ACT OF 1959

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced an important bill to eliminate some built-in inequities in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959. I have requested unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD so that I might discuss this bill with my colleagues and point out the need for this legislation to correct existing inequities.

In my opinion, the Health Benefits Act is one of the most useful and intelligent pieces of legislation ever passed by the Congress of the United States. It gives to approximately 2,500,000 Federal employees a measure of protection and security that had been denied them for too many years.

However, no legislation devised by the mind of man is ever perfect. In two significant respects the Health Benefits Act has failed to achieve what the Congress intended it to achieve. The bill I have introduced will, in effect, restore to the act the intentions the Congress had when it was first signed into law.

Congress, Mr. Speaker, intended to give the Federal employees a health insurance program equal to those prevailing in modern American industry. To do this, the Federal Government—as the employer—would have to contribute to the program at least half the overall cost, with the employees contributing the other half.

Because of technical difficulties, which my bill would correct and overcome, things have not worked out that way.

The Federal Government's contribution today averages around 38 percent, while the employees' contributions average around 62 percent.

The Federal Government should serve as an example for private industry in these matters. Instead, we are considerably behind private industry in the management of our health benefits program. My bill would bring the Federal Government up to date in the health benefits field by making it an equal partner with the employee in paying for the program on a 50-50 basis.

This was the intention of the Congress when the bill was discussed and passed in 1959. I feel certain of this. By approving this bill that I have introduced, we shall merely be carrying out the original intentions of the Congress.

There is another inequity in the original bill which was never intended. This concerns married women with non-dependent husbands. A nondependent husband is presently excluded from the benefits of the act, while a nondependent wife is included. This is not only illogical, it is contrary to the spirit of our times. In addition, it is grossly unfair. My bill would also eliminate this inequity.

I sincerely hope and trust that the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will consider this bill as soon as possible. Since I have the honor to be a member of that committee, I shall do everything in my power to assist in winning for this bill a speedy approval, both in the committee and on the floor.

#### VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to note and to respond to the murmurs of criticism, which I have heard in recent weeks, aimed at the present President of the United States, who is in fact a disabled veteran of World War II, and who, it is alleged, is trying to reap political advantage from his status as a veteran.

There seems to be building up a resentment against the status of the President as a disabled veteran, his deep interest in veterans' affairs, and his feeling of closeness to our former fighting men and their families.

There seems to be implied in this undercurrent of carping a strange theory that somehow the President is making political capital of his veteran's status and his interest in their affairs.

This sniping reminds me of the sniping on the great battlefields of World War I. It was always the courageous fellow advancing in front of all the other soldiers who drew the heaviest enemy fire.

This seems to be happening now to the President.

Now it is undeniable that he is a veteran, and—a disabled veteran—others have called him a war hero. But never has he himself referred to his combat

record as anything but that of a citizen doing his best, the same way most veterans regard their wartime contribution.

As evidence to support this outlandish political theory, it is pointed out that President Kennedy participated personally in the 1961 Veterans' Day ceremony at Arlington National Cemetery; that he has seen fit to honor the memory of deceased veterans by issuing a Memorial Certificate to the next of kin; that he twice proposed that Congress increase the compensation rates of the service connected; that, following enactment of this increase, the veteran received a notice with his check stating "President Kennedy has signed a law"—that veterans were similarly reminded of the President's role in the acceleration of insurance dividend checks.

It is undeniably true that President Kennedy has felt deeply his kinship with veterans. He was the first President to play an active part in the national observance of Veterans' Day. Not since 1954, when this holiday was so named, did a Chief Executive personally participate in the ceremony as he did in 1961.

Mr. Speaker, I honor the President for his personal participation in the Veterans' Day ceremony at Arlington National Cemetery, for by doing so he is relating service to one's country with the history of our Nation, with our national character, purposes, and present-day problems. This is a most fitting, a most proper usage of the prestige and power of the head of state.

I would say that his leadership of the national ceremonies did much to lift this great day of dedication out of the obscurity and apathy into which it had declined.

I would say that it is absurd to grumble and to point out that President Kennedy's predecessor did not do likewise.

Likewise, it is absurd to look behind the President's issuance of a Memorial Certificate for a political motive. This is a decent, thoughtful, human act. I am appalled to hear it referred to as a "politically inspired action."

The critics also mutter darkly about inserts mailed out with insurance dividend and compensation checks. The facts are simple. The insert used with the regular 1961 Government life insurance dividend said that the payment was "part of the President's program." This was done to clearly call attention to the fact that it was an advance payment made on the assumption that policy premiums would be continued for the entire year, or else an overpayment would take place. It was the first time dividends had ever been paid in advance. Normally, they are paid over an entire year at the anniversary date of each individual policy. At the time, the press was full of news about the President's program to advance the economy and of the part to be played by paying GI dividends ahead of time. Therefore, this wording was used to identify the checks, and so prevent needless, delaying queries from individuals.

Similarly, a notice went out with payment of service-connected compensation



checks of October 1962, following enactment of the law which provided for an increase in the service-connected compensation rates. The purpose was to explain that the veteran's check was augmented by a 3-month retroactive increase, and to forestall a deluge of telephone calls, letters, and personal visits inquiring about the extra amount.

Again, press attention at the time had focused on the President's action in signing the compensation increase, a measure he had twice urged Congress to pass. The VA so identified the check. In effect, it was simply a quick, easily understood method of saying "this is the compensation increase you have been reading about in the newspapers."

The criticism of these inserts seems to be based on an unusual theory of the President's freedom of speech.

It is permissible, so this theory goes, for the President to talk to the American people on radio or television. He may also deliver a speech, address, or remark in person. It is acceptable for him to give interviews and be quoted extensively in newspapers, magazines, or books—both hard cover and paperback. The President may also direct a message to the public via posters or signs.

However, if a Presidential message—or even bare mention of his name or office finds its way into envelopes that are mailed to individuals or groups, then complaints are heard about "political motivation and partisan machinations."

May I add that the use of the name of the President of the United States in announcing actions of the Federal Government is common practice. The President, after all, is the Chief Executive. Illustrative of this practice is the enclosed announcement to all Federal civilian employees. It mentions a new low-cost group life insurance plan "developed as a part of the program of this administration." It bears the personal signature of President Eisenhower.

GROUP LIFE INSURANCE FOR FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D.C., August 17, 1954.

To Federal Civilian Employees:

As a result of favorable action by Congress, we are now able to provide the benefits of low-cost group life insurance to Federal employees. The proposal to provide this protection to employees through private insurance companies, with Government assuming a portion of the cost, was developed as a part of the program of this administration to improve the Government's personnel system.

I urge all eligible employees to give serious consideration to this worthwhile program which will help provide economic security for their families.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

#### THE PLAN AT A GLANCE

##### What are the benefits?

Life insurance at low cost without requiring a medical examination.

Payment of double indemnity for accidental death.

Payment for accidental loss of one or more limbs or eyesight (dismemberment).

Life insurance after retirement at no cost to you.

Free insurance if you are 65 years of age or older.

#### Am I eligible?

Yes, unless you (1) are a noncitizen employed overseas, or (2) fall within the small group of employees excluded because of the nature and type of employment, such as part time, seasonal, or intermittent employment.

#### Who pays for the insurance?

You pay 25 cents per \$1,000 of insurance each biweekly pay period by payroll deduction until you reach age 65. If you are paid on other than a biweekly basis, the cost is proportionate. (See table following.)

The Government helps to pay the cost of this insurance by contributing half as much as you do.

#### How do I become insured?

If eligible, you will be automatically insured unless you fill out standard form 53 (waiver of life insurance coverage) which is available at your personnel office.

#### For how much will I be insured?

The amount of insurance depends upon your annual basic salary. (See table following.)

You may not choose a lesser or greater amount of insurance.

If you are 65 years of age or older, or when you become age 65, the amount of your insurance will be reduced by 2 percent for each month you are over 65 until a reduction of 75 percent is reached. The remaining 25 percent stays in effect.

#### Must I name a beneficiary?

No. Your life insurance will be payable in the following order: (1) widow or widower, (2) children, (3) parents, (4) estate, (5) next of kin. Your personnel office will have the proper form for you to use if you wish to change this order or name someone else.

#### What if I retire?

Your life insurance is provided without further cost, if you retire on an immediate annuity either for disability or after at least 15 years of creditable service, at least 5 years of which are civilian. Your double indemnity and dismemberment protection stops.

#### What if I leave Government Service?

Your life insurance continues in effect 31 days during which you may buy, without a medical examination, an individual life insurance policy at standard rates.

#### May I cancel my insurance under this plan?

Yes, at any time.

#### Insurance schedule

If annual basic salary—	Amount of insurance	Amount of deductions per pay period			
		Weekly	Biweekly	Semi-monthly	Monthly
Is not more than—					
\$1,000.....	\$1,000	\$0.13	\$0.25	\$0.27	\$0.54
\$2,000.....	2,000	.25	.50	.54	1.08
\$3,000.....	3,000	.38	.75	.81	1.63
\$4,000.....	4,000	.50	1.00	1.08	2.17
\$5,000.....	5,000	.63	1.25	1.35	2.71
\$6,000.....	6,000	.75	1.50	1.63	3.25
\$7,000.....	7,000	.88	1.75	1.90	3.79
\$8,000.....	8,000	1.00	2.00	2.17	4.33
\$9,000.....	9,000	1.13	2.25	2.44	4.88
\$10,000.....	10,000	1.25	2.50	2.71	5.42
\$11,000.....	11,000	1.38	2.75	2.98	5.96
\$12,000.....	12,000	1.50	3.00	3.25	6.50
\$13,000.....	13,000	1.63	3.25	3.52	7.04
\$14,000.....	14,000	1.75	3.50	3.79	7.58
\$15,000.....	15,000	1.88	3.75	4.06	8.13
\$16,000.....	16,000	2.00	4.00	4.33	8.67
\$17,000.....	17,000	2.13	4.25	4.60	9.21
\$18,000.....	18,000	2.25	4.50	4.88	9.75
\$19,000.....	19,000	2.38	4.75	5.15	10.29
Is above \$19,000.....	20,000	2.50	5.00	5.42	10.83

#### A FINAL WORD ABOUT THIS INSURANCE PLAN

This plan will provide an added measure of family security at low cost. It is, however, term insurance and does not carry cash surrender or loan privileges. You should not look upon this plan as a substitute for regular individual insurance policies purchased through your own insurance agent.

This leaflet outlines the principal features of the plan for your general information only. Each insured employee will receive a certificate outlining in more detail the benefits and terms of this group insurance.

#### SPECIAL DIVIDEND, 1961

The enclosed check or statement is a special dividend on your Government life insurance policy. This dividend is an extra one being paid in 1961, and represents your share of gains and savings in the insurance fund.

#### VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION.

Always keep your choice of beneficiary up to date.

(VA form 9-5976 (NR), May 1961.)

#### NOTICE SENT TO INSURED TO HAVE DIVIDENDS LEFT ON DEPOSIT

The VA is paying ahead of schedule the 1961 dividend on Government life insurance as part of the President's program for advancing the economy. These advance payments are made on the assumption that your premiums will continue to be paid for the remainder of your policy year. If premiums are not so paid, this dividend will constitute a partial overpayment which will become an indebtedness against your insurance.

#### VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION.

(VA form 9-5974 (NR), February 1961.)

#### NOTICE

President Kennedy has signed a law increasing service-connected compensation rates for disabled veterans. The increase is included in the enclosed check. This check also includes a retroactive payment equal to a 3-month increase as provided by the new law unless special action is necessary. In that case you will get your adjustment check in the near future.

The table on the back of this notice shows some of the new wartime rates. Compensation based on peacetime service is paid on approximately 80 percent of the amounts shown.

Degree of disability	Old rate of payment	New rate of payment <sup>1</sup>
10 percent.....	\$19	\$20
20 percent.....	36	38
30 percent.....	55	58
40 percent.....	73	77
50 percent <sup>2</sup> .....	109	107
60 percent <sup>2</sup> .....	120	128
70 percent <sup>2</sup> .....	140	149
80 percent <sup>2</sup> .....	160	170
90 percent <sup>2</sup> .....	179	191
100 percent <sup>2</sup> .....	225	250

<sup>1</sup> The amount payable for all checks received after the first one.

<sup>2</sup> Veterans disabled 50 percent or more may receive an additional allowance for dependents. The law does not change the amounts paid for dependents.

[U.S. SEAL]

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
HONORS THE MEMORY OF

This certificate is awarded by a grateful nation in recognition of devoted and selfless consecration to the service of our country in the Armed Forces of the United States.

President of the United States.

# RECORD OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the action just taken by the House there does not seem to be much point in continuing this particular discussion. However, I originally requested this time in order to clarify the record established by the Committee on Education and Labor during the last session of Congress under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New York, the Honorable ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, with the various members of the committee co-operating with him; and also to indicate some of the vital items of legislation before the committee in this Congress.

In order that various Members may have the opportunity to discuss their own particular work, Mr. Speaker, at this time I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to do so may include their remarks on this subject, in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. RYAN of New York). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, rather than to take up the time of the House now, I think it would be proper for me to put my remarks in the RECORD at this point and simply add that in view of what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] had to say, I hope that he also will read these remarks as others will, because I think he will find that in many areas education and labor are not quite as separable as might seem to be the case on the surface. We have a bill, for instance, that has to do with manpower training and retraining and this affects not only labor but is a matter of education. We have a matter before us now of the so-called youth opportunity bill which again is very close to both the labor area and the educational area.

I think before we come to any hasty conclusion we should study it very carefully and reach a sound decision.

At this point I am submitting for the RECORD the subject matter under the general jurisdiction of the committee as established under rule XI of the House of Representatives and the committee amplification thereof. At the conclusion of my remarks I will submit a complete record of the legislative achievements of the committee during the 87th Congress.

The importance of some of the major education and labor statutes under the jurisdiction of the committee cannot be overemphasized. Among them are: the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; the

Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947; the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act of 1958; the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959; the Davis-Bacon Act of 1931; the Work House Act of 1962; the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of 1916; the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act; the National Defense Education Act of 1958; the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1954; impacted area laws; Juvenile Delinquency Control Act of 1961; school lunch laws; vocational education laws; teacher training laws for retarded and deaf.

The legislative record of the committee during the 87th Congress is one of notable achievement: 44 bills, requiring extensive hearings and studies by the committee members and staff, were reported to the House. Of these 44 bills, 18 were enacted into law. Among the major laws were the Manpower Development and Training Act; the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act amendments; amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act; extension of the National Defense Education Act; the Work Hours Act of 1962, Juvenile Delinquency, and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961. This, of course, is not a complete list, but only an attempt to indicate to the Members of the House the momentous work being done by the Committee on Education and Labor and the progress made through enactment of measures considered by it. Suffice it to say that the legislative achievements of the committee were significant. Of the 18 bills reported by the committee which were enacted into law, 14 of those bills were enacted in the first 14 months of the 87th Congress.

I need not elaborate on the importance to our country and indeed the whole world of the progress we made in the areas of education and labor. Our position as leader of the free world certainly depends upon such progress. When the leadership of our Nation is threatened, not only by the Soviet Union and the Communist world, but by the impact of the European Common Market and other regional and social organizations, we cannot afford to stand still in these two vital fields. The challenges in these areas are many. All of us, I am sure, realize the tremendous impact of automation in this country; of the difficulty experienced by an unskilled person in finding a job; of the heavy burden of unemployment both to the unemployed and to our society, and of school dropouts and the waste of human talent and energy. It is to these unsolved problems that Congress must address itself.

I can tell you that the members of the Committee on Education and Labor are anxious to fill their legislative responsibilities in these areas. The committee has no intention of resting upon its past achievements, but, rather, looks critically toward the demands of the future. Hearings have just been concluded on the President's youth opportunities bill. During the past 3 weeks the administration's omnibus education bill, H.R. 3000, has been the subject of extensive hearings. Merged into this

bill are general aid to elementary and secondary education and Federal aid to higher education, special education and vocational rehabilitation, renewal and revision of the National Defense Education Act, vocational education and renewal and revision of aid to federally impacted areas. Soon we will begin hearings on the Domestic Peace Corps. No one can overemphasize the importance of the legislation to the future growth and vitality of this great Nation.

Other education bills before our committee having major legislative importance involve creating a National Fine Arts Center, legislation relating to the aged and aging which includes the establishment of a Bureau of Senior Citizens and provisions for Federal assistance for programs in States for projects which will benefit older persons. On the labor side of the committee there are bills concerning the shorter work-week, national emergency disputes, equal pay for equal work, amendments to the Davis-Bacon Act, migratory labor, and others which deserve committee study and action. The committee has embarked upon and is eager to continue the work in these important areas. If the United States is to maintain its paramount position in a rapidly changing and highly competitive world it must give serious consideration to the condition of education and labor and act upon the conclusions of such serious and realistic analysis. We must look ahead now or we shall have only a past to look upon.

In speaking about the legislative accomplishments of the committee I would be derelict if I did not give proper recognition to the invaluable assistance and competency of the committee staff. Dr. Wolfe, the education chief, is presently on leave from Queens College of New York City. She has been in the education field for 23 years with experience as a teacher at all levels and as a principal and administrator. She received her doctor of education degree from Columbia University and did advance work at Vassar College and postdoctoral work at the University of Pennsylvania. She has published numerous articles and made invaluable contributions to American education.

Mr. Gamser, chief counsel for labor-management, after graduating from the New York Law School, had extensive experience in the labor field working for the National Labor Relations Board. He received a Fulbright grant as a lecturer in labor law and has taught labor law at Cornell and Columbia Universities. Through the respective efforts of Dr. Wolfe, Mr. Gamser, and the other very competent members of the staff, the work of the committee has been ably accomplished. Incidentally, Mr. Gamser has only this week been confirmed as a member of the National Mediation Board.

With the aid of a competent staff the committee has published some very comprehensive and valuable studies. To name a few: "Congressional Action for Higher Education," "Federal Assistance for Educational Purposes," "Problems of the Aged and Aging," "Pioneer Ideas in



Education," "Impact of Automation on Employment," "Administration of the Labor-Management Relations Act by the NLRB," and "The New Image in Labor."

Before concluding these general remarks, I should like to point out to the Members that the Committee on Education and Labor, with the enormous workload, though in nature one committee, is in essence two committees. Two subjects as significant, extensive and complex as education and labor could be intellectually divided into separate committees. But through the wisdom of this House by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, envisaging the enormous community of interests of education and labor, the two separate committees were combined and have remained joined. In the highly complex society of today an education in its full sense is certainly necessary for job opportunities. The interrelationships between education and labor are borne out by such legislation as vocational education and rehabilitation, manpower development and training, education of the handicapped. But though this great identity of interests exists, the committee does consider two subjects which in terms of workload and expense are equal to two separate committees. With absolutely no desire to have the committee divided, I do recommend that the double work and expense load be considered.

The Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor is concerned primarily with higher education legislation, education and rehabilitation of the handicapped and prevention and control of juvenile delinquency. I think it cannot be disputed that these are areas vital to the welfare and well-being of our country. As President Kennedy has said in his education message to the Congress on January 29 of this year:

Education is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress.

In the 87th Congress, the Special Subcommittee on Education reported out eight bills after countless hours of public hearings, consultations, discussions and study. The subcommittee answered thousands of letters and inquiries regarding this legislation. On one subject alone, special education for handicapped children, more than 500 letters were received, from all parts of the country. Nearly every Member of the House has referred a letter or inquiry to the subcommittee regarding legislation pending before it. All eight bills reported out by the subcommittee were approved by the Committee on Education and Labor, and five were enacted into law.

These enactments were:

Public Law 87-274, the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act.

Public Law 87-276, to assist in training teachers of the deaf.

Public Law 87-294, authorizing wider distribution of books for the blind.

Public Law 87-262, authorizing a new teaching hospital at Howard University and transferring Freedmen's Hospital to the university.

Public Law 87-137, authorizing an additional Assistant Secretary of Labor.

It was most regrettable that the conference report on H.R. 8900, the College Academic Facilities and Student Assistance Act was not approved and that another bill considered by this subcommittee, H.R. 12070, the special education and rehabilitation bill, was not enacted.

During the 87th Congress, the Special Subcommittee on Education, also considered H.R. 10396 and related bills to assist in developing programs to train highly skilled technicians needed by industry today. No final action was taken on these bills last year.

And in the 87th Congress, the subcommittee initiated a special study of all Federal education programs in order to obtain an overall picture of the educational activities of 42 different Federal agencies and departments. This study is primarily concerned with possible duplication, overlapping, and inconsistencies in the educational programs. The subcommittee will consider and publish its final report on the study in the very near future.

In the 88th Congress, the Special Subcommittee on Education again will turn its attention primarily to higher education and special education legislation. The needs of our colleges and universities for classrooms to teach the growing student population are becoming more pressing. Since this House passed the College Academic Facilities Act on January 30, 1962, college enrollments have increased by more than 8 percent. Let us consider college enrollments in the present decade.

In 1960, there were 3,582,000 students enrolled in our higher education institutions. By last fall, the number had increased to 4,207,000; by 1965, the figure will be 5,220,000; and by 1970, it will climb to 6,595,000—if there is sufficient space for these students.

The student loan fund established by the National Defense Education Act of 1958 currently is providing loans to about 5 percent of the students in institutions participating in this program. But the overall ceiling on loan funds, and the limit on funds for any one institution, has restricted the program at some of our largest colleges and State universities. More than 90 colleges and universities, with an enrollment of some 900,000 students, would be eligible for larger loan funds if the present institutional ceiling did not exist.

The President's Science Advisory Committee tells us that our increasingly technical civilization will require substantial gains in the number of Ph. D. and master's degrees awarded each year in the physical sciences, mathematics and engineering. We are frequently reminded that we need more engineers, more technicians, more highly trained personnel in almost every field.

In special education, we still are desperately short of adequately trained teachers for the 6 million handicapped children of school age. Only one-fourth of these children now are receiving the special education they require.

These are some of the areas which the Special Subcommittee on Education must consider during the 88th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in the time I have taken to make these remarks I have attempted to affirmatively state, not defend, the record of the committee. That record can stand on its own merits. The committee and the staff did anticipate a highly productive year resulting from application of skills and knowledge to an enormous workload. We are aware of our responsibilities to the House and to the Nation and eagerly seek to fulfill them. It would seem to me a most shameful waste if we are to jeopardize needed, significant legislative accomplishments by letting personal animosities control us.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for reference a detailed record of the accomplishments of the House Committee on Education and Labor:

#### JURISDICTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, ESTABLISHED BY RULE XI, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

- (a) Measures relating to education or labor generally.
- (b) Child labor.
- (c) Columbia Institution for the Deaf, Dumb, and Blind; Howard University; Freedmen's Hospital, and St. Elizabeths Hospital.
- (d) Convict labor and the entry of goods made by convicts into interstate commerce.
- (e) Labor standards.
- (f) Labor statistics.
- (g) Mediation and arbitration of labor disputes.
- (h) Regulation or prevention of importation of foreign laborers under contract.
- (i) School lunch program.
- (j) U.S. Employees' Compensation Commission.
- (k) Vocational rehabilitation.
- (l) Wages and hours of labor.
- (m) Welfare of miners.

#### Legislative activities in the fields of education and labor during the 87th Congress

##### GENERAL STATEMENT

Bills referred to the committee.....	741
Total bills reported out of committee...	44
A. Bills reported by the committee and enacted into law.....	18
B. Bills reported by the committee, passed in House and Senate and pending in conference at end of the 87th Congress .....	1
C. Bills reported by the committee and denied a rule.....	12
D. Bills reported by the committee and pending before Rules Committee at end of the 87th Congress.....	21
E. Bills reported by the committee, granted a rule, but consideration not completed in the House.....	1
F. Other legislative inquiries.....	10
G. Committee prints.....	10
H. House reports on legislation.....	41
I. Conference reports.....	4
J. Hearings held.....	49

<sup>1</sup> Equal Pay Act of 1962 passed House; passed Senate as rider to H.R. 11880, Foreign Service Building Authorization Act.

<sup>2</sup> Includes one bill which was considered and tabled by Rules Committee, S. 1126 (crew leader registration, migratory labor).

A. Bills reported by the committee and enacted into law:

The Practical Nurse Training Extension Act of 1961, Public Law 87-22. (April 24, 1961.)

Fair Labor Standards Act Amendments of 1961, Public Law 87-30. (May 5, 1961.)

Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act Amendments, Public Law 87-87. (July 14, 1961.)

Additional Assistant Secretary of Labor, Public Law 87-137. (August 11, 1961.)

Establishment of Teaching Hospital for Howard University, Public Law 87-262. (September 22, 1961.)

Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961, Public Law 87-274. (September 22, 1961.)

Teachers for the Deaf and Speech Pathologists and Audiologists, Public Law 87-276. (September 22, 1961.)

Education of the blind and increased appropriations for the American Printing House for the Blind, Public Law 87-294. (September 22, 1961.)

Metallic and Nonmetallic Mines Safety Act, Public Law 87-300. (September 26, 1961.)

Federal Employees' Compensation Act Amendments, Public Law 87-339. (October 3, 1961.)

Extend National Defense Education Act of 1958; extend impacted areas (extension of Public Law 815 and Public Law 874), Public Law 87-344. (October 3, 1961.)

Amendment to title II of National Defense Education Act, Public Law 87-400. (October 5, 1961.)

Manpower Development and Training Act, Public Law 87-415. (March 15, 1962.)

Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act Amendments, Public Law 87-420. (March 20, 1962.)

Work Hours Act, Public Law 87-581. (August 13, 1962.)

Captioned Films for the Deaf, Public Law 87-715. (September 28, 1962.)

Amendment to Manpower Development and Training Act, Public Law 87-729. (October 1, 1962.)

National School Lunch Act Amendment, Public Law 87-823. (October 15, 1962.)

B. Bills reported by committee, passed in House and Senate and pending in conference at end of the 87th Congress:

College Academic Facilities Act, H.R. 8900. (Passed House 319 to 79, January 30, 1962.)

Equal pay for equal work, H.R. 11677. (Passed House by voice vote July 25, 1962.)

C. Bills reported by the committee and denied a rule:

Federal Coal Mine Safety Act Amendments, H.R. 5741. Reported April 13, 1961; denied a rule June 7, 1961.

Crew Leader Registration Act, H.R. 7812. Reported July 19, 1961; denied a rule August 23, 1961.

D. Bills passed by committee and pending before Rules Committee at end of the 87th Congress (date referred):

Education:

Federal aid to higher education, H.R. 7215 (May 26, 1961).

H.R. 7300, general aid to elementary and secondary education (June 1, 1961).

Overall revision of National Defense Education Act, H.R. 7904 (July 6, 1961).

Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, H.R. 4172 (July 19, 1961).

Emergency Educational Aid Act, 1961, H.R. 8890 (August 24, 1961).

Revision, National School Lunch Act, H.R. 8962 (February 21, 1962).

Adult basic education, H.R. 10896 (April 2, 1962).

Amendment to Land-Grant Colleges Act to eliminate the "separate but equitable" clause of the act, H.R. 11707 (May 23, 1962).

Amendments to impacted areas laws to deny payments to school districts that practice racial discrimination and segregation, H.R. 10056 (May 31, 1962).

University extension, H.R. 11340 (May 31, 1962).

Quality Education Act, H.R. 11888 (May 31, 1962).

Special education and vocational rehabilitation, H.R. 12070 (July 5, 1962).

Amendment to titles II and III of National Defense Education Act (H.R. 13204) (October 2, 1962).

Labor:

Youth Employment Opportunities Act, H.R. 10682 (March 29, 1962). (This superseded earlier bill referred to rules in first session.)

Occupational Safety Act, H.R. 12306 (July 5, 1962).

Equal Employment Opportunities Act, H.R. 10144 (February 8, 1962).

Davis-Bacon Act Amendments, H.R. 10946 (April 5, 1962).

National Council on Migratory Labor, S. 1132 (July 5, 1962).

Crew Leader Registration Act, S. 1126. (Referred April 18 and tabled September 20, 1962.)

Education for migratory children, S. 1124 (July 5, 1962).

Joint industry promotion (amendment to sec. 302(c)(6) of Labor-Management Relations Act, H.R. 11537 (May 22, 1962).

E. Bill reported by committee, granted rule, consideration not completed in House at end of session: Amendment to Fair Labor Standards Act dealing with migratory child labor, S. 1123 (considered on floor October 4, 1962).

F. Other legislation inquiries—ad hoc subcommittees:

Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation.

Subcommittee on the Administration of the National Labor Relations Act by the National Labor Relations Board.

Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment.

Special subcommittee inquiry on the administration of the Davis-Bacon Act.

Subcommittee on Irregularities in the Garment Industry.

Advisory Committee on Higher Education.

Subcommittee on Integration in Federally Assisted Public Education.

Study group on federally impacted areas.

Special study on federally assisted educational programs.

Field study of juvenile delinquency.

G. Committee Prints:

Education:

Federal Aid for Education. (A history of proposals which have received consideration by the Congress of the United States, 1789 to 1960.) May 1961.

The University in Latin America: Argentina and the Alliance for Progress, September 1961.

Federal Interest in Education, September 1961.

Activities and Accomplishments of the Committee on Education and Labor During the 1st Session of the 87th Congress, December 1961.

Higher Education in the Soviet Union, January 1962.

Congressional Action for Higher Education, January 1962.

The New Image in Education, February 1962.

A Directory of Federally Financed Student Loans, Fellowships, and Career Training Programs in the Field of Higher Education in the United States, April 1962.

Cultural Factfinding Mission to Latin America and Caribbean Countries, April 1962.

Integration in Public Education Programs, May 1962.

Views on Relationships of Church and State in the Field of Education, May 1962.

Interim Report on Education and Citizenship in the Public School System of Puerto Rico, August 1962.

Problems of the Aged and Aging, October 1962.

Publications With a Major Emphasis Upon Education. (A selected bibliography.) November 1962.

Pioneer Ideas in Education, December 1962.

Federal Assistance for Educational Purposes. (Part I: Digest of Laws; Part II: A History of Proposals Which Have Received Consideration by the Congress, 1789 to 1962.) December 1962.

Labor:

Worker Participation in Business Management, February 1961.

Some Important Dates in the History of American Labor, February 1961.

A compilation of economic data on industries affected by H.R. 3935 and other bills to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, February 1961.

Comparative print showing changes to be made in existing law by H.R. 3935 as reported by the committee, March 1961.

Federal Labor Laws, a Compilation, March 1961.

Impact of Automation on Employment, June 1961.

Farm Labor Contract Registration Act of 1961, July 1961.

Fair Labor Standards Act Amendments of 1961, July 1961.

Administration of the Labor-Management Relations Act by the National Labor Relations Board, September 1961.

Applicability of Anti-Trust Legislation to Labor Unions; Selected Excerpts and Bibliography, September 1961.

Federal Labor Laws, Revised Compilation, November 1961.

Activities and Accomplishments of the Committee on Education and Labor—Activities in the Area of Labor Legislation, December 1961.

The New Image in Labor, June 1962.

Legislative History of the Davis-Bacon Act, September 1962.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, during the 87th Congress the General Subcommittee on Labor had pending before it a number of legislative proposals involving youth employment, Youth Conservation Corps camps, construction site picketing, disabled Government employees compensation, programs for providing adult basic education for uneducated adults and programs in the field of occupational safety.

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

Hearings were held by the subcommittee beginning on June 14 and extending through July 6 on H.R. 7536 and related measures to establish programs of on-the-job training, public service employment on a Youth Conservation Corps in order to provide employment opportunities and increase the employability of out-of-school and unemployed young people between the ages of 16 and 22. Following subcommittee action on this measure the full committee reported H.R. 8354—House Report 833—on August 2, 1961. The subsequent passage of the Manpower Development and Training Act included an amendment providing on-the-job training opportunities for young people obviating the need for title I of H.R. 8354. Following the subcommittee's consideration, the full committee reported H.R. 10682—House Report 1540—which bill eliminated title I of H.R. 8354 and made other modifications to the previously reported bill. On May 16 the House Rules Committee held 1 day of hearings on the request of the House Education and Labor Committee for a rule on H.R. 10682. No further action

<sup>1</sup> Senate passed an Equal Pay Act as a rider to H.R. 11880, the Foreign Service Building Authorization Act, thereby placing final passage within jurisdiction of Foreign Affairs Committee. There was objection to unanimous consent to go to conference on H.R. 11880 in form presented by Senate.



was taken on the measure in the 87th Congress.

In the 1st session of the 88th Congress the General Subcommittee on Education conducted 6 days of hearings on H.R. 1890, the Youth Employment Act, making provision for a Youth Conservation Corps in title I and a local public service employment and training program. The subcommittee has held 3 days of executive sessions to consider further action on the bill. We hope to have the Youth Conservation Corps legislation before the full committee of the House Education and Labor Committee next week for consideration.

#### CONSTRUCTION SITE PICKETING

Since the Supreme Court decision in the *Denver Building Trades* case, 341 U.S. 675, decided in June 1951, various legislative proposals have been made with respect to amending section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended. Such legislation has been often referred to as construction site picketing bills which deal generally with the question of whether or not picketing activities at a construction location because of a dispute with a subcontractor should be considered a secondary boycott and an unfair labor practice when there is no dispute with the prime contractor. Extensive hearings were conducted on this legislative issue by the General Subcommittee on Labor in the 1st session of the 87th Congress. This identical legislation in the 86th Congress was reported out of the Education and Labor Committee, but did not clear the House Rules Committee.

#### FEDERAL EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION ACT

The subcommittee held hearings on amendments to the Federal Employees Compensation Act during the 1st session of the 87th Congress and reported H.R. 8871 to the full committee. This measure corrected an oversight in the Federal Employees Compensation Act, Public Law 86-767, which excluded District of Columbia government employees from the benefits of section 104 of the act. H.R. 8871 passed the House of Representatives on September 12, 1961, and passed the Senate on September 14—Public Law 87-339.

#### ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

Because large numbers of adult citizens, in many instances comprising the hard core of our unemployment, lacked the basic education to enable them to be retrainable under State and Federal programs designed to increase the employability of unemployed workers, the General Subcommittee on Labor took an active interest in legislative proposals to establish programs of adult basic education instruction. Consequently, the General Subcommittee on Labor with the Select Committee on Education, held hearings on various legislative proposals in this field resulting in report of H.R. 10896 on April 2, 1962, House Report 1551.

#### OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY LEGISLATURE

On April 17, 1962, the General Subcommittee on Labor started hearings on H.R. 11192 and related measures which would encourage the development, ini-

tiation and expansion of occupational safety programs in the States through grants to States for demonstrations and experiments on occupational safety. Hearings were concluded on May 2. At an executive session of the subcommittee on June 27, a clean bill, H.R. 12306, was reported to the full committee. On June 28 the full committee ordered reported favorably H.R. 12306—House Report 1965.

In discussing the work of the Education and Labor Committee in this session of Congress, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the administration for its comprehensive and penetrating analysis of the problems facing American education and the constructive program for dealing with those problems which is embodied in the proposals of H.R. 3000, the National Education Improvement Act of 1963.

Recognizing the vital role of education in the life of the individual citizen and the dependence of the Nation's future upon the competence of a fully educated people, the administration has surveyed the American educational scene in its entirety and proposed for our consideration a program carefully designed to deal simultaneously and effectively with the major problem areas in which the Federal Government must play a more crucial role.

The program is selective. It is not designed to solve all domestic problems, nor to usurp the traditional local responsibilities for education, but rather to concentrate Federal resources in such a way as to stimulate State and local response and thus to strengthen the independence of existing school systems. Wherever possible, it is transitional—aimed at providing immediate and adequate relief to acute problems—while permitting local authorities to prepare to deal with them on a continuing basis. Above all, it is a balanced program, related in all its parts to achieving over the whole spectrum of American education its aims of improving the quality of education at all levels; meeting the challenge of providing facilities for the vastly increased school-age population which faces us in the sixties; and enlarging the opportunities for each individual, whatever his present level of education, to develop his capabilities to their fullest potential.

This is not a partisan approach. Nearly half—11—of the programs are based on the continuation and expansion of programs already voted into law by preceding Congresses. The results and experience gained under the National Defense Education Act, the Library Services Act, and the Vocational Education Act, together with consultations with the various educational organizations, the resources of the Office of Education, and the wisdom of specially appointed panels of independent experts have all been skillfully weighed in creating the 13 new proposals.

The 24 programs contained in the bill fall into 5 major categories:

First. The expansion of opportunities for individuals in higher education.

Second. The expansion and improvement of facilities for higher education.

Third. The improvement of educational quality through better teaching methods and more and better teacher training.

Fourth. The strengthening of elementary and secondary education through the construction of facilities and the raising of teachers' salaries.

Fifth. The expansion and improvement of opportunities for vocational and continuing education at many levels.

These programs necessarily take many forms. The problems facing American education today are neither simple nor unrelated. The task of this committee in carrying out its responsibilities has been immeasurably aided by the precision and sound judgment which this bill represents in identifying and defining the most urgent of these problems. These numerous proposals have been developed into a cohesive program.

Nevertheless, the field is controversial, the programs are detailed, and the study of this measure in its entirety is a responsibility of great magnitude for this committee and its staff.

Perhaps no task facing this body this year will have as far-reaching effect on both the individual citizens of this country and the future of this Nation—as an example to the world of the benefits to be derived from free institutions—as the full and deliberate consideration of this comprehensive approach to the education of our youth.

The General Subcommittee on Education plans to hold extensive hearings on vocational educational needs. It plans to continue studies and hold hearings on educational problems in connection with retraining, particularly with respect to the educational opportunities and needs of an estimated 11 million American adults who lack formal education in the basic areas of mathematics, reading, and writing.

The General Subcommittee on Education plans to conduct hearings regarding special educational needs in economically distressed areas of the Nation to ascertain to what extent the Federal Government can or should be providing assistance to bolster educational facilities in areas where there has been long prevailing unemployment or underemployment. It will be recalled that the Public Works Acceleration Act, Public Law 87-658, specifically precluded the use of public works funds for planning or construction directly or indirectly of any school or other educational facility. Preliminary information available at this time indicates that in areas where unemployment has prevailed over a long period of time, educational deficiencies are the severest and contribute substantially to a growing national problem involving increasing numbers of hard-to-employ citizens, increased welfare and other public financial loads. This area should be fully explored as to what specific improvements to the educational assistance in such areas are needed and to what extent assistance to these areas will be in the national interest.

I am confident that when we, the Members of this 88th Congress, have completed our work, that we will pass a

bill that will give the Nation a comprehensive program of Federal aid to education. As America moves into the age of space, every young person in every corner of the land must have an opportunity to receive a good education so that he can develop his maximum abilities. Then we will guarantee the ever expanding growth and security of our country.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on at least two occasions in the past several weeks it has been stated by Democratic members of the Education and Labor Committee that the Harlem project was a fine example of the programs which would be accomplished under the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961. A close check of the slipshod manner in which this project has started gives little to substantiate the high hopes of these colleagues.

Close scrutiny of the handling of the affairs of the project group indicates many interesting discrepancies which lead me to believe that we are in really poor shape if this particular project is supposed to be the model which Attorney General Kennedy, this administration and Members of Congress picture.

As is often the case, a little homework will unearth some truths which are glossed over when superlatives are used to describe a project or program the merit of which is more political and superficial than real.

The Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development has been obliged to mildly chastise the project in Harlem which is proceeding under a grant of \$250,000 made last year. Training project No. 63201 is currently being conducted by Associated Community Teams, Inc., known as ACT. Many interesting discrepancies were turned up in a recent audit. It was determined that a very incomplete accounting and auditing system was being used. The regional auditor, Division of Grant-in-Aid Audits of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare noted that transactions "involved a number of errors which were not adjusted in any systematic way."

Further, it was noted that accounts "are inadequate to control the expenditures being made by this agency."

It was even necessary to call in a CPA for the purpose of auditing these accounts.

Anyone who knows anything about the incorporation of an organization is aware of the fact that basic records must be kept concerning original meetings, bylaws, and so forth. Yet, the auditor noted:

Although an "official minute book" was purchased, the formal original minutes were not available.

Little pretext was given as far as carrying on a businesslike operation is concerned. I do not know the laws of the State of New York but after reading the auditor's report, I would be surprised if ACT were in compliance with the corporation statutes of that State. In an almost cryptic comment, the auditor tells us:

Other than as noted in this memorandum, no particularly significant entries were found.

On the very face of the lease of space from the Adam Clayton Powell Community Center on West 137th Street in New York City, it can be seen that the period of the lease extends 2 months beyond the present approved termination date of this project. Are they so sure that it will be renewed? The rent of \$2,000 per month was not questioned although I am still of the opinion that the Committee on Government Operations should take a good look at the set-up involved in this training project, the lease and every facet of its operation.

In the important area of personnel, several interesting factors were noted by the auditor. The project director is being paid at a salary of \$15,000 which exceeds any of the salaries provided for in the approved budget. The auditor gives us a good idea of what has been going on when he reported:

During the period under audit (July 1, 1962, to November 30, 1962), there were no time, leave, or attendance reports kept.

It is also interesting to note that no procedure was in effect for formally documenting personnel actions, appointments or changes in pay, nor was there any written statement of conditions of employment or personnel policies. About the only thing that was definite in this arrangement was the salaries. The record is very silent as to working hours, responsibilities, leave policies, and so forth.

The facts cited are nothing more than a superficial checking of this Harlem project. I hesitate to guess what would be brought out if a thorough investigation of this project were completed.

Attorney General Kennedy used superlatives to describe this vanguard of the Domestic Peace Corps. Members of my Committee on Education and Labor have used superlatives to describe it. Some have suggested that they are a little tired of hearing about it since they feel any criticism of it is an attack on our committee chairman which is certainly not the case.

Consider the very inefficient manner in which the taxpayers' funds have been accounted for. I have known Mr. Wingate, the project director, for 2 years and found him a very competent employee of our committee. It appears to me that he was thrown into the middle of this situation and is confronted with a virtual impossible task. I certainly hope he can give us something to show for the quarter of a million dollars we will spend.

The payroll of ACT approaches \$60,000 per year as can be seen in the report which I have included after these remarks. Coupled with the \$24,000 rent of their quarters we see a bureaucratic overhead of almost \$85,000 at the very start.

I submit that none of us here in Congress would, in a private capacity, tolerate such a situation. None of us as responsible businessmen, lenders, stockholders, directors, or managers would touch anything which is so loosely drawn and poorly organized. Why do we tolerate such a condition to exist simply because the Government is picking up the bill?

When you look around at the mushrooming growth of Federal bureaucracy and the waste and duplication that we have in so many other areas of Federal activity, you can only come to the conclusion that this Harlem project, described in so many superlatives by our top brass, is a fitting offspring to an irresponsible parent. I suggest that Secretary Celebrezze and Attorney General Kennedy take a good second look at the activities of Associated Community Teams, Inc.

FEBRUARY 15, 1963.

(Attention: Chief, Field Branch.)

To: Office of Field Administration, OS Division of Grant-in-Aid Audits, Room 5743 HEW Building, North.

From: Albert Hirt, regional auditor, New York.

Subject: Audit of juvenile delinquency grant, ACT.

At the request of the Special Assistant to the Secretary for Juvenile Delinquency we have made a review of the fiscal transactions of the Associated Community Teams, Inc., Training Project No. 63201, as reported on a preliminary financial statement for the period July 1, 1962, through November 30, 1962. Although we made the usual verification of the actuality and accuracy of expenditures and fund balances, our chief attention was directed toward the propriety of expenditures to date and acceptability of the fiscal and related procedures now in use. We made no attempt to evaluate program operations or personnel qualifications since these areas are outside the scope of our competency. We were accompanied during the review by Mr. George Roemer of the special assistant's staff.

We have the following comments:

#### 1. ACCOUNTING SYSTEM

At the time of our visit, January 30, 1963, the accounts consisted of a cash disbursements book and a checkbook. The last posting to the cashbook was November 30, 1962. Check transactions, as reflected in the stubs, involved a number of errors which were not adjusted in any systematic way. The balance in the checking account was not carried forward after January 7, 1963. These accounts are inadequate to control the expenditures being made by this agency. When requested to prepare a statement of expenditures (as of November 30, 1962) it was necessary to call in a CPA for this purpose. The position of "bookkeeper-auditor" provided in the approved budget has not been filled.

#### 2. BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETINGS

Although an official minute book was purchased, the formal (original) minutes were not available. Loose copies in a manila folder were provided and covered the following meetings: August 11, 16, 23, September 7, 27, November 11, November 8, 20, December 13, 20, all in 1962. After encountering a reference to a meeting on October 25, 1962, we asked about the corresponding minutes. A freshly made photo copy was given us. We were assured by Mr. Wingate, acting executive director, that the file of minutes was now complete. Other than as noted in this memorandum, no particular significant entries were found.

#### 3. RENT OF PREMISES

ACT has formally rented space (approximately 25 rooms) on the first (3,737 square feet) and second (3,917 square feet) floors of the Adam Clayton Powell Community Center on West 137th Street in New York City. The period of the lease is July 9, 1962, through December 1963 (project termination date). Use of furniture and fixtures in the space and maintenance of the premises are included in the rental which amounted to \$1,155.74 for the initial period from July 9,



1962 to August 31, 1962, and \$6,000 per quarter, payable in advance, for the remainder of the lease term until December 1, 1963, when payment of \$2,000 will be due. Before establishing this rate the agency obtained two appraisals of the premises. The first (Frost) resulted in a \$3 per foot estimate including furniture, utilities and maintenance. The second (Hanson) produced the same rate including janitor services but no utilities. The lease at the rate of \$2,000 per month was thereafter completed.

The terms of this lease provide for \$6,000 payments on September 1, December 1, 1962, March 1, June 1, 1963, etc. It should be noted that any payment on June 1, 1963, for a quarterly period will cover 2 months beyond the present approved termination date of this project.

#### 4. PERSONNEL

There is attached a schedule setting forth the salary data concerning personnel employed during the period of audit and comparing titles and rates of pay with the approved budget. In addition, the minutes of November 20, 1962, authorize the appointment of Mr. Carl Johnson as Director of Peace Corps and Acting Project Director at a salary of \$15,000.

#### Associated Community Teams, Inc.—Summary of salary expenditures and comparison with budget

Position title	Annual salary rate		Incumbent	From	To
	Budgeted	Expended			
Project director.....	\$14,000	\$14,000	M. Lewis.....	July 16, 1962 <sup>1</sup>	Aug. 24, 1962 <sup>2</sup>
Program coordinator.....	13,000	13,000	R. Kurahara.....	do <sup>1</sup>	( <sup>3</sup> )
Trainee supervisor.....	8,500	8,500	G. Jones.....	do <sup>1</sup>	( <sup>3</sup> )
Office manager-administrative assistant.....	7,500	7,500	B. Griggs.....	do <sup>1</sup>	( <sup>3</sup> )
Telephone operator-receptionist-typist.....	4,800	4,800	W. S. Bowden.....	Aug. 14, 1962	( <sup>3</sup> )
Special assistant to director.....	12,500	12,500	G. Broadfield.....	Oct. 22, 1962	( <sup>3</sup> )
Stenographer.....	3,640	3,640	M. Clark.....	Oct. 9, 1962	Nov. 4, 1962
Do.....	4,160	4,160	do.....	Nov. 5, 1962	( <sup>3</sup> )
Trainee supervisor.....	8,500	4,100	R. Giles.....	Nov. 20, 1962	( <sup>3</sup> )

<sup>1</sup> Appointments approved by Board action Aug. 11, 1962, effective July 16, 1962.

<sup>2</sup> Resigned.

<sup>3</sup> Through Nov. 30, 1962 (end of audit period).

<sup>4</sup> Appointment authorized by Board per minutes of Oct. 11, 1962. Salary \$10,000 to \$13,000, "to serve in any capacity the Board sees fit."

NOTE.—Appointed as consultant at \$75 per day from Oct. 9 to 12, 1962; at \$200 per week from Oct. 15 to 19, 1962

#### FEBRUARY 20, 1963.

Mr. LIVINGSTON WINGATE,  
ACT, Inc., Adam Clayton Powell Community  
Center, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. WINGATE: We have just received the report of our regional auditor in New York who audited your books on January 30, 1963. He notes a number of deficiencies, including the following:

#### 1. THE ACCOUNTING SYSTEM

The balance in the checking account was not carried forward after January 7, 1963. The last posting to the cash book was November 30, 1962. The position of bookkeeper-auditor provided in the approval has not been filled.

#### 2. BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETINGS

The formal (original) minutes were not available.

#### 3. RENT OF PREMISES

The terms of the lease provided for payment beyond the life of the grant.

#### 4. PERSONNEL

Inadequate time records were kept. These and other deficiencies noted make it important that I discuss this with you and our regional auditor at your earliest convenience. Please contact me immediately so that we can arrange this meeting for a followup on the audit.

I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely yours,

BERNARD RUSSELL,  
Director, Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development.

During the period under audit there were no time, leave, or attendance records kept. Some time thereafter a procedure for daily sign in and out sheets was instituted.

No procedure was in effect for formally documenting personnel actions (appointments, changes in pay, etc.). The minutes indicated Board approval of some appointments but made no mention of others.

No written statement of conditions of employment or personnel policies (leave policies, working hours, etc.) could be located.

#### 5. OTHER

Two reported expenditures requires future adjustment. A payment of \$400 (miscellaneous) covers a deposit with the telephone company and a reported unliquidated obligation (subsequently paid—check No. 1134, \$483.16) covers expenses of Mr. Fred Hubbard, a per diem consultant. A refund is due on this payment because only a portion of Mr. Hubbard's time was devoted to ACT. According to correspondence between ACT and Mr. Russell of DHEW the remainder of Mr. Hubbard's time is chargeable to the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency.

Copies of some of the ACT publicity material are attached for your information.

I know for I introduced it in 1957 and there it remained, until Mr. Eisenhower left Washington, and Mr. Barden retired to his farm.

A sop was offered to the unemployed in the form of "temporary unemployment insurance" but, after that, came the inevitable active membership on our relief rolls.

The only monument erected for labor, under Eisenhower and Barden, was one approved by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers and every ultraconservative and reactionary group in America, the infamous Landrum-Griffin bill, which restricted our recognized labor unions and created conditions forcing them to expend their energies and moneys to protect the rights they had secured through previous legislation. Their chances for expansion and growth went out the window with the passage of that act.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, during those years, this committee was run under the guidance and with the full approval of big business and with no thought nor consideration for the average American citizen who tomorrow might join the ranks of the unemployed.

In regard to the field of education the other major responsibility of our committee the record under Eisenhower and Barden is not only pitiful but disgraceful.

With the need for additional educational opportunities becoming more and more apparent each year, our committee remained stagnant.

In 1956, I introduced legislation providing scholarships for students who were mentally capable and desirous of furthering their education but were financially unable to meet the required expenses.

These scholarships were to be under the direction of the National Science Foundation, strictly nonpolitical, the Nation, as a whole, would have benefited. There was, even then, a need for engineers, a shortage of scientists, a dearth of mathematicians, teachers in our secondary and elementary schools, and our colleges and universities were scouring the Nation for qualified personnel.

In 1957, I reintroduced this legislation and all we heard was from our friends at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers saying "this is a local matter, it can be handled better at the local level; all those who want to get an education can find a way to do it."

That session of Congress closed, adjourned, on August 30, with no action.

Then, in October of 1957, sputnik entered space.

In November, Mr. Eisenhower started making speeches on our need for more educational facilities and more opportunities. He even thought a few scholarships, financed by the Federal Government, might be wise.

Well, we got the National Defense Education Act, in 1958—with student loan programs, with assistance and loans to our institutions of higher education.

But, we owe our thanks for this progressive move not to the Eisenhower-

Barden leadership but to Russia and to Sputnik.

In the following 2 years no further gains were made in the educational field. We maintained our status quo.

However, in 1961, when the leadership of this Nation and the leadership of this committee changed hands the whole atmosphere in the field of education and labor changed.

At the end of the 87th Congress the record shows that this Committee on Education and Labor reported to the Rules Committee 44 bills, 22 on education and 22 on labor.

The 87th Congress passed 18 of these bills, 9 on education and 9 on labor, and they were good bills. They were legislation in the interest of the people of America, not just the vested interests of the Nation.

The manpower training bill, to train and educate our long-term unemployed, was passed. That was what I wanted Eisenhower to do back in 1957, but he and Barden did not believe in recognizing we had an unemployment problem. Profits were still coming in at a satisfactory rate.

The Minimum Wage Act was improved and increased, the Welfare and Pension Act was improved, a survey to determine requirements for mine safety was approved, specific hours were set for workers on projects operating with or by Federal moneys, the railroad workers were included in our Manpower Training Act, programs were enacted for practical nurses' training, additional special programs were initiated for teaching the blind and the deaf, school lunches were extended, student and construction loans were extended under the National Defense Education Act, a program was started for the correction and control of juvenile delinquency, and other long-overdue measures were enacted into law.

This is the record of the Committee on Education and Labor under the dual leadership of Kennedy and POWELL.

These men believe in both education and in labor.

There is still much to be done to catch up for the 8 years of idleness we drifted through under disinterested and incapable leadership.

The whole Nation is now aware of the inadequate educational program we have allowed to exist—

With approximately three-quarters of a million dropouts from high school, untrained and uneducated for gainful employment in the space era we are entering;

With the prospects of 7 million more this decade, unless we act and act quickly;

With automation and technological advancements increasing output daily—while it decreases employment in these same areas;

With hundreds of thousands of our adults needing special academic educational programs as well as technical ones;

With the problem of those between the ages of 40 and 65 that industry feels are too old to start new careers, but, we know they are too young to retire;

With all these issues to be faced and solutions to be found, this committee must have an adequate staff and adequate funds to do the job.

The chamber of commerce and the NAM are still sending out flyers—newsletters and special announcements—that these jobs should be done at a local level—that Congress should not interfere, that we should settle back and not bother ourselves, just let nature take its course.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we have learned our lesson. I hope we realize we cannot retreat into our shell and watch the world go by.

If our people are not gainfully employed and almost 6 percent of our people are not, then our Nation will suffer.

During this 88th Congress I hope to be able to continue what we started last session.

Many of the Members of this House realize that the findings of my Subcommittee on Unemployment and Automation, which resulted in the Manpower Training and Development Act of 1962, merely scratched the surface of our most serious domestic problem. When this legislation was passed, just a year ago this month, it was stated in this House that "this program, we know, will not completely solve our unemployment problem but it is a step in the right direction, and the first of many we will have to take to attain full employment and insure an expanding economy."

We cannot afford to stop now, Mr. Speaker. If we do, these problems we still have will not even be considered and no attempt will even be made to try to find solutions.

I sincerely feel the record of the Committee on Education and Labor, in the 87th Congress, is one to be held in high esteem and it is one that we, who are members of this committee, can be proud we helped produce, for the legislation we sponsored and we had passed was for the benefit of the average American and the good of the Nation as a whole.

#### NEW FRONTIER PROGRAMS IGNORE TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, last October 5 I had occasion to make a long speech about urban renewal and certain abuses which had developed in that program. I was trying to place emphasis on technical difficulties which were responsible for the embarrassing position in which the administration found itself. As I examine the proposed budget for fiscal 1964, I find many of the same technical difficulties. The President seems to be acting on impulse rather than on any sound technical basis.

This is a serious charge and I do not make it lightly. Therefore, I should like to submit evidence in support of the assertion just made.

For the present, my attention will be focused on the welfare part of the New Frontier program, which, in spite of suggestions to the contrary, is being ex-

panded at a faster rate than most other segments of the budget, including national defense. The justification for this expansion is political rather than logical or reasonable. The New Frontier is trying to capitalize on a formula developed by the New Deal. That formula reads somewhat as follows:

First. Many persons are in need.  
Second. The Nation has resources with which to meet the need.

Third. The Federal Government should use the resources to meet the need.

This is not a syllogism with its major premise, minor premise, and conclusion. It presents no logical pattern of reasoning. The justification for the formula is the assumption that people will accept and support it. That assumption, which stood up rather well for about 30 years, is now beginning to wear thin and is in danger of falling under the heavy load which the President is trying to place upon it.

I am not going to argue with the first two points in the New Deal formula. They have too much popular appeal. They also have just enough truth in them to make difficult their denial.

My quarrel is with the third point in the New Deal formula. And in this fight, the technological evidence is on my side. Logically, points 1 and 2 do not justify the conclusion implied in point 3. Technologically, no standards or criteria can be developed by which to administer Federal social welfare programs to produce the results which the administration promises when it proposes Federal financial involvement.

Let me move immediately to a set of specific examples which will show both the failure of past budget appropriations to produce the results expected and the probability that future appropriations of the same kind can lead only to the disillusionment of people and a waste of the Nation's substance.

#### URBAN RENEWAL

The first example has to do with urban renewal. It summarizes the evidence submitted to this House on October 5 last, and in a previous speech. Some of you may recall that in the October 5 speech my indictment of the urban renewal program was built around the following three simple questions:

First. How is need for urban renewal determined?

Second. Where does the money come from?

Third. Who gets the money?

Discussion of need centered on the impossibility of establishing standards by which to measure the extent of need. As a result the recipients were allowed to determine the extent of their need. Abuses inevitably resulted. When the Federal Government failed to correct the abuses it made itself a party to the fraud and encouraged other communities to participate in the fraud.

Discussion of the millions of dollars involved indicated that, as a national policy, the Congress of the United States was taking tax moneys from the poor and sending that money into the greatest centers of population and wealth in the Nation. Such a policy is unprecedented in a democracy.



Discussion of who gets the money suggested that the poor families displaced from urban renewal areas do not benefit financially. The money actually provides windfall profits to slum landlords, excessive fees to planning consultants, and opportunities for great profits with minimum risk for large corporations now taking over the redevelopment of project areas all across the United States.

Does someone suggest that these are abuses which can be corrected without casting doubt on the validity of Federal participation in urban renewal? Any such suggestion indicates a complete misunderstanding of the technology which must apply to this activity. The fact is that no patterns or procedures can be developed in advance, which can be made applicable on a national scale, and which will predict the results of projects to be undertaken with Federal funds. The advocates of Federal urban renewal and many other programs are making false promises when they appear before the committees of Congress and say, "If you will appropriate funds, we will find ways to administer the programs so that they will produce the results expected from them."

#### MUST BE MEASURED BY RESULTS ACHIEVED

The best technology in this field was developed before the New Deal formula was invented. Dr. Clarence E. Ridley, for years the executive secretary of the International City Managers' Association, investigated the development of standards by which to measure the effectiveness of public services, and said they could be measured but only in terms of results achieved, not in terms of methods or procedures formulated. All his subsequent studies served only to confirm that thesis.

What Dr. Ridley has done is to pull the rug from under the New Dealers and the New Frontiersmen in any promises of performance which they make in connection with welfare programs. The only valid test of these programs is the result achieved. In urban renewal the evidence is that the Federal effort has been a failure. More than 200 projects initiated with assurances of the fullest possible Federal support have failed. Seventy percent of the land cleared for redevelopment has not been put to the originally planned reuse.

This statement is not made in opposition to urban renewal. I am for urban renewal. But I am for a program which works. And, in spite of all the successes which are claimed for the Federal program, I know that it will never be technologically sound until it is completely revamped. Federal appropriations to continue it in its present form are a waste of taxpayers' money. It is slower, more costly, and less efficient by far than completely local programs which have been developed and demonstrated and which are available for national application.

#### AREA REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

My second example is the area redevelopment program established in the Department of Commerce but with assistance from the Departments of Agriculture and Labor, among others. The

stated purpose is to assist areas of substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment in planning and financing economic redevelopment, and to establish stable and diversified local economies.

This program has been in operation long enough to demonstrate that its political expediency far outweighs its technical soundness. The program has been used to "bail out" communities where need undoubtedly existed but where precedents, established to meet the need, can plague the economy as a whole. The program has injected Government into economic and industrial development in ways never contemplated in the Constitution.

Let us not take time to examine the constitutional question involved. That would raise an endless debate about policy on which evidence may not be conclusive to some.

Let us concentrate instead on certain aspects of the program where the results speak for themselves.

The record indicates clearly that the Department of Commerce has been willing to assist low-wage precarious industries to help a locality even when such help is in conflict with national goals of high wages, increased productivity, sound investment, and healthy profits. Two examples which are part of the record, follow:

First, Dan Goldy, Deputy Administrator of the Area Redevelopment Administration, speaking before the Western Forest Industries Association in San Francisco in March 1962, said:

We might as well go out of business if we can't make loans although there might be plenty of capacity in an industry already.

Second, The Washington Post for December 9, 1961, carried a story about the first project approved by ARA. The headline was: "Mountain Home Territory Didn't Get Its Industrial Revolution for Nothing." The introductory paragraphs of the story follow:

MOUNTAIN HOME, ARK.—To get a shirt factory employing 500 women at low wages this depressed area had to—

Provide a modern, air-conditioned building financed with a \$535,000 bond issue.

Lease the 75,000-square-foot, one-story building to the shirt company for 35 years at a monthly rental of \$1,500, a sum that is not large enough to cover the cost of the structure and interest on the bond issue.

Raise real estate levies \$6 a year for the average taxpayer to make up the difference between the cost of the plant and the rental income.

Allow the shirt manufacturer to renew his lease for another 64 years at a token cost to him of only \$1 a year.

Maintain the building and its 20-acre site, which is in a field 7 miles west and one-half mile east of the tiny town of Gassville, Ark.

Furnish temporary quarters, at a cost to area businessmen of at least \$10,000, so workers could be trained and production could begin before the new building was completed.

Obtain \$160,000 in aid from the Area Redevelopment Administration—the first grant and loan under the new depressed areas program—to build a water system adequate to the needs of the plant.

Agree not to encourage the location of any plant in the area that would compete with the shirt factory for women workers.

Become partner to a further agreement that in effect pledges the community to help the company keep a union out of the plant.

A second aspect of the ARA program on which the record speaks with eloquence has to do with planning. The law requires that before any locality can become eligible for this particular form of Federal aid, an overall economic development plan must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Commerce.

#### NO TECHNICAL STANDARDS

The Area Redevelopment Administration has been unable to develop technical standards or criteria by which to judge impartially and objectively the merits of these submissions. The result is that the Government is free to exercise discrimination either for or against a community. It can put a locality into a business where it does not belong and where the long-range outlook is dismal. It can help one community to upset an entire industry.

The ARA is gathering information in Washington which could be used to undermine the private enterprise system. The Government can use the information to plan and compel certain kinds of economic activity to be undertaken in certain parts of the Nation. This is already being done in the missile and space programs, presumably in the interests of national defense. A comparable control can be established over much of the economy by the area redevelopment program and without any comparable justification.

Once such control has been established by the Federal Government, the average businessman will no longer be free to exercise his independent judgment in the operation of his business. His decisions are no longer determining. He must wait to see what the Government is going to do. If the Government decides to set someone up in competition with him under conditions more favorable than he can create for himself, his economic fate is sealed.

The fate of communities can be controlled also. The sound economy of one city can be destroyed by actions taken by the ARA under existing legal authorizations. The data which these communities submit in support of their applications for Federal aid can be used against them. Political decisions can take the place of economic forces in the determination of their future.

#### ARA IN AGRICULTURE

One final aspect of the area redevelopment program deserves consideration in this look at the record. It concerns the part which the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture is asked to play.

As you know, the Extension Service has had a long service in helping the American farmer. It has been an educational and an advisory service designed to help the individual farmer make his most advantageous adjustment to circumstances.

The Extension Service has been concerned with policy questions in agriculture but always on a basis which kept the Service from becoming involved in

controversy. The traditional approach of the Service to public problems has been set forth clearly in the following statement from Cornell University in connection with what it has chosen to call Operation Advance:

The objective of Operation Advance is not consensus. Everyone in a group is not expected to agree on answers. The purpose of the discussion is to help each leader develop and refine his or her own judgments. This is done by forcing the examination of individual concerns in broad context, by stretching individual thinking, and by developing some understanding of unfamiliar considerations, points of view and interests. The purpose of Operation Advance is not to make policy, but to serve as a basis for informed action by individual leaders. Therefore, agreement or consensus by the group is neither essential nor helpful. Thus, Operation Advance provides education support for leaders of organizations and groups involved in action in a political democracy.

As part of the area redevelopment program the Extension Service has been asked to combine its traditional service to individuals with group decisions and social action. Consensus is to be relied upon to decide the projects for which Federal aid is to be requested. This can involve the coercion of minorities by majorities. It can generate conflict instead of the cooperation which is essential for sound community development.

We are doing a favor to the President when we eliminate these technically unsupportable items from his budget. We are saving him from grievous failures which can have an adverse effect on the economy and must finally turn the people against him.

#### ADVANCING CIVILIAN TECHNOLOGY

My third example of budget requests which cannot be technically supported has to do with a request for \$7.4 million for "advancing civilian technology." The construction, machine tool, and textile industries have been selected as the immediate focus for this kind of technological advancement.

Let us concede that everyone wants to advance civilian technology. Let us also concede that some of the research which might be helpful is not now being done.

Such an admission of need offers no technical support for the proposed appropriation. It leaves completely unanswered the question: How will the Federal appropriation accomplish what is needed?

Emphasis on the improvement of civilian technology is not original with this administration. The problem of improvement has been under study for about 10 years in connection with the work of the Small Business Administration. That agency has had funds with which to study and to take advantage of every possible technological advance for the benefit of small business. The results have been meager. It is results rather than predictions or promises upon which the Congress must rely in appropriating public funds.

Let me comment specifically on the concept of advancing civilian technology as it applies to the construction industry. The need for such a program is not generally accepted. Indeed many individuals and organizations certain to

be affected by the program are not sure what the program is intended to accomplish, how it will be operated, or how it may affect the vast research program which private enterprise is now financing.

At present, research programs are being carried out by many individual corporations, large and small, and by various trade associations. While no accurate information is available about the total funds involved, many experts are convinced that the amount exceeds \$250 million. In many areas the construction industry has developed technical advances which are years ahead of what the public is prepared to accept.

The administration has no clearly defined procedure for this program of advancing civilian technology. It has not even discussed its general approach to the problem with important segments of the construction industry. Leaders of this industry, whose cooperation is essential to the success of the Government's program, do not have confidence in it and are not prepared to help make it work.

The only way to reassure the construction industry about this program is for the Government to formulate in advance the criteria or standards by which the program will be controlled. The available evidence indicates that such a formulation is technologically impossible. That is what makes the administration's position untenable and requires that the Congress refuse to make the requested appropriation.

#### FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

My fourth example is taken from the field of education. Here again the President has seen fit to make excursions into uncharted fields without any substantial technical support.

To help concentrate attention on the technical aspects of Federal aid to education, let me make certain disavowals. I am discussing the obvious need for every American to receive the best possible education. Nor am I raising any question about the availability of resources with which to make that education possible. I am asking what technical evidence exists to support the claim that the Federal Government either can or should control the course of American education. I concede that we can appropriate money. I insist that money alone will not insure the kind of education which America needs.

Last year the President made certain recommendations about Federal aid to education. Because he could not give necessary assurances about the effect of these proposals he was not successful in having them enacted. As I understand the situation, both he and the Congress agreed that certain studies should be made to establish a foundation of fact upon which new proposals could be based. These studies were initiated. The results have not yet been made available for the consideration and reaction of many of the important segments of education certain to be affected by any decisions made and action taken. Nevertheless, the President has seen fit, without waiting for the facts which he

once recognized to be essential, has submitted a most elaborate program of recommendations to the Congress. He has given no indication of standards or criteria by which the programs will be administered. He can give no assurances about results which will flow from the programs.

Let me review quickly three of the principal studies which were initiated in an effort to determine the proper place of the Federal Government in education.

The first was initiated by a Special Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor. The report of the Special Subcommittee has not yet been made public and presumably was not available at the time when the President's program was formulated. Certainly, its technological contribution has not been tested in the crucible of public discussion.

The second study was referred to in the President's message. It concerns the report of the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education. That report has not yet been published and subjected to public criticism. There is available at present no evidence that the report will provide any technical foundation for the proposals which the President has incorporated in title V of H.R. 3000.

The third study is being made by the President's Committee on Youth Employment. No report has been made public. Nevertheless, the President has seen fit to make recommendations which cannot be supported technically until the report has been published and ample time for the reaction of interested groups has been allowed.

How serious is this lack of technological support? Some of my colleagues across the aisle may suggest that it is not damaging at all. That my claim that the President, in acting before the facts have been established, is not making recommendations contrary to the facts. They may suggest that the studies, when completed and made public, will support the President's position.

The matter is not that simple. The wisdom of the ages will not be found in the three reports just mentioned. There already exists an extensive body of technology which the President has chosen to ignore.

Let me give you a single example involving the question of whether Federal aid should consist of general appropriations without control or itemized appropriations with careful specifications of activities. Senator Robert Taft used to say that Federal aid must involve either strict control or waste. He insisted that no middle ground could exist.

The President is now trying to straddle that issue. He is trying to do both. And he is acting before he has a sound technical basis for either one.

I am sure all of you know that the Hoover report indicated the existence of more than 200 educational programs in the Federal Government. No administration has been powerful enough to establish coordination of these programs at the Federal level. There is no semblance of control over the impact of these programs on educational institutions and on communities.



Partial evidence has accumulated to indicate that Federal programs are already beginning to have harmful impact. A recent Brookings Institution report indicates that Federal programs have already become a major influence on the career planning of individuals. Many college leaders are concerned about the emphasis on science and mathematics at the expense of the humanities and the social sciences.

The President may have standards or criteria of his own on which he is willing to base fundamental educational decisions for the American people. But these standards have not been revealed to the people. They do not have the support of scholars in the field. They can become a menace to the entire educational system of the Nation. We should examine them most carefully before we attempt to implement them with Federal funds.

A fifth, and an almost perfect example of either ignoring or violating the technical knowledge of the day is to be found in the Youth Employment Act proposed by the President and now under consideration by the House Committee on Education and Labor.

The Youth Conservation Corps proposed by this bill, H.R. 1890, would abandon the realistic desire to provide youth with salable skills to fill identified job opportunities in favor of a program designed to remove young men of the Corps from the ongoing economic activities of their communities and States. The Corps men will be no better prepared to fill manpower needs after their tour in the "woods."

The YCC proposal appears to assume economic conditions in the 1960's comparable to those in the 1930's when the predecessor program, the Civilian Conservation Corps was established. However, our unemployment today is but a fraction of that of 30 years ago. Actually a shortage rather than excess of skilled labor exists.

Here again technology is being ignored. The administration has no criteria or standards by which to justify the proposals included in the Youth Employment Act. Nevertheless it persists in trying to make political capital out of problems which its proposed procedures cannot help solve.

This is my effort to present what I think to be the technological failure of this administration in the various programs confronting us. We are spending money like water without actually getting back to the guidelines that I referred to.

That philosophy I say is in error; that is, since the American people have needs, and the United States has resources to meet the needs that the Federal Government should use those resources to meet the needs. I do not believe that is the role of the Federal Government and technologically the evidence is all on my side.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman said something about control in Federal aid to education. I am wondering if the

gentleman from Texas is suggesting that perhaps there would be no more control over aid to education than there is over aid to the farmer.

Mr. ALGER. I think the gentleman has given an apt analogy. There would be control, and he and I know it. I think the majority of the American people have the proof that the farmer is so controlled that he cannot even decide what he shall grow on his own farm to use for his children and his own stock. But that kind of control is embraced in anything that the Federal Government does. That was set out in the remark of Senator Taft. The gentleman knows and I know that when the Government gets into education, the education of our youth will indeed be controlled.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas on this very excellent and timely presentation. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor I have had the opportunity to hear some of the testimony in regard to the Youth Conservation Corps proposal. One of the very mystifying developments is the contradiction in testimony by Cabinet-level officers as to what the purpose of this training program would be. Several have denied emphatically that it was intended to impart new skills to those attending, while other members of the Cabinet have insisted that that was the proper purpose. So here indeed the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing or is even proposing to do.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his observation. I think once again, where a need is recognized, and we can all recognize needs, we too frequently immediately formulate Federal programs. But there is no assurance that first, this is the area for the Federal Government and that, second, we can accomplish under any procedure or criteria or standards these goals that they say need to be attained.

Mr. Speaker, the point of my entire presentation has been this. We all agree that there are needs and we know that somehow or other these needs will be met. But the Federal Government, by going in right away with money, has been unable to set up standards under which this money can be equitably distributed into the various districts of our country, or where the programs may be set up, or where results may be achieved in accordance with what we set out to do. That is the burden of my entire statement today, that by the yardstick of results achieved, ever since the early days of the New Deal, it was proven over and over and over again, that the Federal Government, even when it goes into a field presumably to solve a problem, does not solve that problem. For instance, in the welfare field, because of an inability to lay down procedures and guidelines this merely postpones the day of reckoning, or admits that it was a failure. That was the result in trying to solve unemployment, or the farm

problem. And now we are trying to do the same in the welfare field by spending proportionately more than even our defense. It strikes me that it is time to look for a technological base by which we can measure the Federal programs, where the Federal Government is to be involved, or indeed make the agonizing reappraisal that will delete, will eliminate, Federal programs that have failed to solve problems, measured by results achieved.

Mr. Speaker, I hold that the Federal Government is not designed nor intended to feed, clothe, house, provide jobs, medicines and the basic necessities of life. That is my philosophy. Constitutionally I think our forefathers had this their reason for not laying down those areas as the role of the Federal Government. When we get into them as government, there is no technology that we can use. The Federal Government cannot do a better job than the people can do for themselves. I really believe the American people can do for themselves better than government can. They can spend their own money better than government can spend it for them.

#### PUBLIC OPINION ON THE ADMINISTRATION'S POLICIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I believe this is the first time I have had a special order since I was a freshman Member of the House of Representatives. I do so now only, as I see it, to set straight a record which I think should be set straight. I would not even do that if I were not concerned about some effort being made to distort the record and the impact that this effort could have.

I have a profound respect for the press of this country. I spent my college years as a newspaper reporter.

I have a profound respect for the magazines in our country. I try as best I can, with the limited amount of time that all of us have, to read most of the magazines. I particularly respect the U.S. News & World Report, which comes to the desk, I think, of every Member of Congress every week. I get it here and at my home in Orleans.

What I have to say has nothing to do with the editorial opinion taken by that magazine or any publication. What appears on the editorial page is the property of the publisher. One may disagree with what appears. That is in the tradition of American journalism, and is as it should be. But it has come to my attention that there has been a questionnaire circulated among the Members of the House. I will not read all of the questions, but they go something like this:

1. Why is President Kennedy, as a Democrat, able to exert so little influence over a House and Senate that have majorities heavily Democratic?

2. White House messages and ideas go to Congress and seem to disappear. As far as anyone can see they generate no response out in the country. Why?

3. Has the President failed to get into tune with the mood of the country?

4. Is there a feeling that the President's plans do not command wide support among the voters?

And so forth. There are several others that I will place in the RECORD. They are already in the RECORD, in fact. There is no secret about them. They appear on page 3220.

I am familiar with polls. I may say that anyone who makes a poll and anyone who uses a poll never asks what is regarded as a loaded question, because if you are going to take a poll you want to get honest answers. You want facts, not fiction.

I remember seeing the great chairman of the Republican National Committee just a week before the last election. He was and still is a good friend of mine. He is a member of the other body. The rules being what they are, I will not mention his name.

We talked about the upcoming election. It was the 1960 election.

He said to me, "All of our indications are it is very, very close."

I said, "What do you mean by your indications?"

He said, "The polls that we have conducted,"—and one thing led to another, and finally he said, "Well, there is no secret about this, I will show you one." And he did. It indicated that the election would be within one or two percentage points throughout the Nation. That was an accurate poll. Now when his committee hired whoever made that poll, they did not give them a set of loaded questions—they went out to find out exactly what the people were thinking, they were not attempting to justify a preconceived notion about what people might be thinking.

Now let us analyze some of these questions for just one moment.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. I have listened to the gentleman explain about the questionnaire. I am sure I never received one. I have inquired of some of our Members here on the floor, and they say to me that they never received any such questionnaire. I might have been tempted to respond with some answers had I received a questionnaire. Could the gentleman tell us whether that was just distributed to Members on the other side of the Capitol, or did Members on his side here in the House of Representatives receive a questionnaire?

Mr. BOGGS. I am frank to tell you that I do not know. I had a gentleman from this magazine come to see me and ask me some of these questions. He did not hand me the questions, however, to be quite frank with the gentleman. The questions, as I read them to you, are as inserted in the RECORD by a Member of the other body, and I was informed that they had been circulated. If they have not been circulated, then I am in error.

Mr. HALLECK. Certainly I am very positive that no such questionnaire came to me, and no one has come to my office

to interrogate me along the line of any of these questions. Of course, there might have been a rather limited circulation on the questionnaire. I might ask at this time if any of my colleagues who are now present on the floor on our side of the aisle received any such questionnaire? Evidently no one has received any such questionnaire, and the indication is negative in reply to that inquiry.

Mr. BOGGS. I am reassured by the gentleman from Indiana because the tenor of the questionnaire alarmed me from the point of view of objectivity and from the point of view of what the function of the Congress is.

Mr. HALLECK. I would add this further thought, if the gentleman will yield, with reference to the inquiry as to who might have received the questionnaire, I would not want that to be taken as some sort of condemnation so far as I am concerned of the distribution of the questionnaire.

Mr. BOGGS. I did not interpret the gentleman's remarks as a condemnation of it at all, and if I gave any such impression, I wish to make it plain that that was not my intention. But I will say to the gentleman, some of these questions—although not all of them—were asked of me by a staff member of this magazine. Of course, I am not being critical of the magazine, but I am being critical of this approach and I will discuss this as objectively as I know how. In the first place, I do not think that any Congress should be a simple echo of the executive branch of the Government. I have had the great privilege of serving here for a good many years, and I respect what this body is—a House of Representatives. I consider myself first, last, and always a Representative of the people who elected me. But this is quite different from an attitude of obstructionism. For we have another branch of Government called the executive branch of Government. It is the duty of the executive branch of Government to give direction and to execute and administer the laws enacted by the Congress. The executive branch must carry out the foreign policy of the United States and perform all the other duties that are enunciated in the Constitution and in the statutes passed by the Congress.

Now let us just examine some of the implications implicit in the questions. I hope that they have not been circulated or even asked in this fashion of others. But they are a matter of record and I would like to talk about them for just a few minutes.

Let us talk about the question of the President's messages. I do not think there is anything particularly sacred about a message from the President of the United States, but I am sure I can pretty well demonstrate that these messages have not just suddenly evaporated and that nothing further has been heard about them or that "they seem to disappear." If anyone has any such notion, it is just not correct. Let me read the subject matter of some of these messages.

There was the state of the Union message on January 14. No one will take

exception to a state of the Union message by the President of the United States.

Then on the 17th of January there was the budget message. If anyone says that it has disappeared, then obviously no one is watching television programs or reading editorials in the press or listening to witnesses before the Ways and Means Committee or before the Appropriations Committee. As a matter of fact, regardless of what position you may take on the budget, whether you think it is too big, too small, inadequate, inflationary, whatever it may be, anyone who thinks that that message has suddenly disappeared is just not acquainted with the facts of life in this month of March 1963.

Then there was the economic report. Did it disappear? It seems to me the gentleman from Missouri, for whom I have a deep respect—he and I serve on two committees together—I think the Joint Economic Committee is meeting this afternoon to agree or disagree on its own analysis of the economic health of the Nation—can answer that question.

Here are the facts: each year the President submits an economic report which goes into detail about the economy as he sees it; then the Joint Economic Committee holds hearings on the President's report—the message that he sends down to the Congress—the one that allegedly disappeared. We have had a whole host of very distinguished witnesses appear before that committee to comment on that message. Some have agreed with the President's recommendations, the President's analysis; some have disagreed. Some have said that the tax proposals are wrong; some have said they are right. Some have said they are adequate; some have said they are inadequate. But this has been the subject of great discussion before the Joint Committee for the past month.

So to say that the question has been laid aside is just not so.

Just a few moments ago we heard the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished gentleman from Dallas, Mr. ALGER, make a very fine statement of his beliefs. Just a few moments ago he disagreed with the recommendations of the President relative to the young people in our country. But this shows that the message on youth has not disappeared. This matter is being discussed very widely. You will hear more about the youth employment act, about the domestic Peace Corps, about the Conservation Corps. You will hear more about the growing problem of juvenile delinquency. Why will you hear more about it? Because whether the President sends a message about it or not the problem is with us. It is estimated that within the next several years there will be 70 million young people under the age of 20 living in our country. So we are bound to hear a great deal about juvenile delinquency and youth problems.

The President also sent up a message on mental health, the first one that ever came to Congress on this question, and the related one of retarded children. There is hardly a family in the United States that does not have some experience with this whether it be as a result of the devastations of service in World



War II or in Korea, or the strains and stresses of the times in which we live, whether it be the advance of medical science which has enabled doctors to maintain life where it could not be maintained before, especially of children who might have died under former circumstances. This is a problem that confronts us.

This morning I heard on the radio that the American Medical Association, which does not always agree with the recommendations of the present administration, had endorsed many of these proposals relative to mental health. And I am informed by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that a bill pending before his committee would aid medical education—which bill overlaps both the education message and the mental health message—is nearing completion in that committee.

I could go on with these messages. There is the one about taxes. Would anybody for one moment say that we have disregarded that message? We have a list of witnesses a mile long scheduled to appear before the Ways and Means Committee. We have hearings scheduled until the end of March, with the most distinguished panel of witnesses I have ever seen.

The point I am making is that I do not understand this kind of approach. The notion that these messages have no impact, that there is no responsibility, that they have no connection with the problems confronting the country, the Nation, and the world, is not so.

Let us deal with some of these other matters. The first proposition in the questionnaire. The notion that the President has not exerted any influence on the Congress.

As I said a moment ago, I am not one who thinks because the President says X ought to be X that it should necessarily be X. I had the great privilege of sitting in on some Presidential conferences with a former Speaker of the House, and I have the privilege today of sitting in these conferences. As all of you know the legislative leaders confer with the President. Speaker Rayburn used to say to the President—to quite a few presidents—and these gentlemen say to him today: "Mr. President, that cannot be done. We disagree."

Nobody requires complete agreement. In the years I have been here there has been only one Congress where the Republican Party was in control of the House and also in control of the executive branch of the Government. We had the 80th Congress, when President Truman was President of the United States, and the Republicans were in control of the House. The only other Congress was the 83d Congress. If my memory serves me correctly, those are the only two times since 1930 when the Republicans controlled the Congress.

How did President Kennedy's program fare in his first term compared to President Eisenhower's in his first term?

I have compiled some figures. I trust they are accurate. If they are not accurate, I will certainly correct the RECORD to make them so. Here are the figures I got.

To the 87th Congress, President Kennedy made recommendations on 53 major matters. That is in the first session. In the second session, he made recommendations on 54 major matters. Approved in the first session were 33 major matters, in the second 40 matters. The first session approved 62 percent, the second session 74 percent.

In the 83d Congress, President Eisenhower's percentages of major recommendations that won approval were 52 and 40 percent. So President Kennedy has fared mighty well.

No one has ever denied the popularity of President Eisenhower. No one ever said President Eisenhower did not fit the mood of the people of the United States. We Democrats who were confronted with running a candidate against him knew what we were up against. Whether we agreed with him or disagreed with him, he had captured the imagination of the American people. Yet, despite that, his percentages were 52 and 40 as compared to 62 and 74 percent for President Kennedy. And despite his popularity in the 83d Congress, President Eisenhower lost the 84th Congress, and the Democrats took control.

The question is asked: Does the President of the United States fit the mood of the people? Well, take a look at what happened last November. There are three more Democratic Senators than prior to 1962, an off-year election, and the character of the House of Representatives changed hardly at all where normally there is quite a change.

I do not cite this in a partisan way. I know my party makes mistakes, and I know that the other party does too. But to give the impression that the President of the United States is devoid of leadership, and in the process to give the impression this Congress has accomplished nothing, is a wrong impression.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I am curious to find out about these questions, because taking up where the minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], left off, apparently no one over here has seen them, except that I have because the gentleman directed my attention to them.

Was this circulated? It has not been published. Were these questions circulated among the Democratic Members?

Mr. BOGGS. It may be that the questions were withdrawn. I gave the best answer I could give to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] a moment ago.

Mr. CURTIS. If the gentleman will yield further, did anyone on this side receive it? Did all of you on the other side receive questions like this? I think somebody is playing a joke on us. That is what I think.

Mr. BOGGS. The questions are so ludicrous that it does take on that aspect.

Mr. CURTIS. I think somebody has played a joke on the gentleman. I do not know. But unless these questions were circulated on the other side—Senator DOUGLAS in his statement just said

they asked this. It does not say who asked the questions. But I agree that these are leading questions.

Mr. BOGGS. I said to the gentleman from Indiana that I had been asked several of these questions by a representative of this magazine—that I personally had been.

Mr. CURTIS. If the gentleman will yield further, I think perhaps they are just putting a needle in you.

Mr. BOGGS. They could have been. I would not think that that was the case. I know the gentleman from Missouri was speaking half earnestly and half facetiously, but I would not expect a major magazine to put the needle in me or anyone else. This would be most surprising.

Mr. CURTIS. That is why I was trying to identify the situation. Apparently this has not been published, and at least as far as I can find out, I know I did not receive any questionnaire. No one over here apparently did. I thought maybe there was a wide circulation on your side. Maybe it is just putting a needle in your leadership.

Mr. BOGGS. It could be.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. If my office has received a copy of these questions, I must confess that I have not seen it. I did see this list of questions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where it was indicated that they were prepared by U.S. News & World Report. It would be unparliamentary to read the entire article.

First of all, I want to commend the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] for the presentation he is making. If a representative of this very respectable magazine did prepare this list of questions he was engaging in a form of journalism which is far below the standards we expect of that type magazine. Every single question is loaded. Every question involves a premise which is adverse to the President of the United States. Every question assumes that the President of the United States does not have that standing among the Democratic Members of this House, or among the Members of the Congress as a whole, or in the Nation as a whole, which we would expect of the leader of this country or of a great political party. This simply is not true.

I think the gentleman in pointing this up is doing the House a service, because this matter is a serious matter, whether the questionnaire has been distributed to every Member of the House or not. The figures, which the gentleman has just put into the RECORD, are accurate in my opinion. I have similar figures which have been prepared by my staff, and they are very, very close to the figures which the gentleman has given us.

The first question asks: "Why is President Kennedy as a Democrat able to exert so little influence over a House and Senate that have majorities that are heavily Democratic?"

The truth of the matter is that the Democratic Party of this House has supported the proposals of the President of the United States time after time in

heavy majorities on issue after issue over the opposition of a majority of those on the other side of the aisle. When this House passed the act extending area redevelopment to rural areas 100 percent of the Democrats voted for the proposal, 75 percent of the Republicans voted against it.

On passage of the bill for aid to distressed areas, which was one of the very important measures submitted by the President of the United States, 83 percent of the Democrats in this House voted on the side of the President and 74 percent of the Republicans voted on the other side. I am not criticizing my friends, I am just reciting the facts.

On the Kitchin-Ayres amendment to narrow and reduce the Minimum Wage Act, 71 percent of the Democrats voted for a higher minimum wage and broader coverage as recommended by President Kennedy; 85 percent of the Republicans voted the other way.

On the greatest Housing Act ever passed by this Congress, the Housing Act of 1961, 85 percent of the Democrats voted for the bill; 85 percent of the Republicans voted against extending housing legislation as contemplated in that bill.

On the water pollution control amendments, to provide pure water for the American people, which was a strong administration measure, 99 percent of the Democrats voted for that bill; 88 percent of the Republicans voted against it.

On the Emergency Education Act of 1961 to provide classrooms for American children 67 percent of the Democrats voted for the bill; 96 percent of the Republicans voted against it.

On the public welfare amendments 99 percent of the Democrats voted "yea" and less than 80 percent of the Republicans voted "yea" although a majority of the Republicans did support that bill.

On the public works acceleration bill 82 percent of the Democrats voted "yea." This was one of the President's really important measures, one that he stressed over and over again to the press and in meetings which the gentlemen attended last year at the White House; 89 percent of the Republicans voted against it.

On the farm bill 84 percent of the Democrats voted "yea" and 99 percent of the Republicans voted "nay."

The story of the 87th Congress is a story of progressive legislation in which the Democrats of this House supported the President of the United States in overwhelming numbers while the Republicans, on the whole, did not do so. These are the facts. This is the answer to the loaded questionnaire to which the distinguished Democratic whip has referred.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I think that is a proper presentation of the record. I glory in my Republican colleagues taking their point of view. This is the way democratic institutions are supposed to function. If it were otherwise we would not have a United States of America. But I think it is a terrible mistake to try to imply that there is no direction, no leadership of any kind in this Congress. When the gentleman from Mas-

sachusetts, JOE MARTIN, and my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana, CHARLIE HALLECK, were leading the House of Representatives back in the 80th Congress and again in the 83d Congress, I had profound respect for their leadership. There were times when they took positions that were somewhat different from those which they had taken when they were in the minority. I understood that, because the problem of being in the majority is quite different from that of being in the minority. When you are in the majority you have to act, you have to decide, you have the responsibility and it is quite a different business from being in the minority. So the gentleman from Oklahoma, the distinguished majority leader, in my judgment has properly stated the case.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not true that when Members of the House did support the President the same politicians of the press made the charge that this was a "rubber-stamp" Congress and that those who supported the President were "rubber-stamp" Congressmen.

Mr. BOGGS. Well, that is right. I would say that that is another matter I would like to touch on for just a moment, because in many ways this is an attack, as I see it, if this thing is going on—and I hope my friend from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is right; maybe I am just being needed. In many ways though this is an attack on Congress. I have been reading newspaper pieces and other things to the effect, "Is Congress Outmoded?" And then there are other pieces indicating that Congress cannot function, that somehow or other the 20th century has left us behind. Of course, if you really want to create a dictatorship, just abolish Congress. I do not care whether you are a Democrat, a Republican, an independent, or whatever you want to call yourself, what this really is is an attack on the Congress itself. I want to go into that for just a moment.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to commend the gentleman initially for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. May I add further that the fact that the gentleman was asked some of these specific questions by a representative of this magazine is all the evidence in the world that should be needed by any Member of this body to establish the authenticity of the magazine as a source for these questions.

Mr. BOGGS. The response I have made to the gentleman from Missouri and the response I made to the gentleman from Indiana are totally accurate. I am not even implying this thing was circulated.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the gentleman from Illinois may have put the source of the item in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It may throw some light on this.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I think I can throw some light on it. I have it on good authority that the magazine had asked for an interview on a series of questions, and the magazine was requested to submit the list of questions that were going to be involved in the interview, and the magazine had submitted the questions in a letter. At that point it was made clear that other magazines asked similar questions of other Members of Congress. Apparently there was no blanket questionnaire sent out.

Mr. BOGGS. The best answer, of course, would come from the magazine itself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I do not know how many other Members of this body may have been questioned by the Gallup poll. Personally I have never been asked a question by the Gallup poll. Most of the people I have talked to have never been interviewed by a representative of the Gallup poll. But the existence of the Gallup poll and the fact that that questionnaire was put out and was given wide circulation and was given a lot of publicity certainly could not be denied by anybody in this body.

Mr. CURTIS. If the gentleman will yield, the only publicity given to this was by the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DOUGLAS, and right here and now, that I know of, unless someone else can point to the publicity. That is what we are trying to find out, or at least I am. I happen to think these are loaded questions, and I think they are rather funny questions in a way, and needless questions to the leaders of your party. I know I get loaded questions all the time. All of us do. If we have not learned by now how to take the sting out of them and turn it back again—I think we all know that. But if this was publicized in any way other than by the people to whom it was directed, I think we are being a little unfair to the U.S. News & World Report.

Mr. BOGGS. I have tried to keep the record completely straight so far as I am concerned. I have no desire to be unfair.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman has been very fair.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Unfortunately I was at a meeting and did not get in on the start of this discussion. Are you discussing the USIA poll throughout the world that nobody seems to know anything about, and that the administration has under wraps?



Mr. BOGGS. No. I wish they would release them if they do have them under wraps.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows they do. We have not been able to get this report.

Mr. BOGGS. No, we were not discussing that; but if time permits and the gentleman wants to discuss it, I will be very glad to discuss it to the best of my ability.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would like to commend the gentleman for calling this subject to our attention today. I am particularly interested in one question that was asked in this survey: "Has the President failed to get into tune with the mood of the country?"

It would appear to me that if the U.S. News & World Report will look at the most recent Gallup poll, they can find their answer there from an awful lot of people in America because, if my memory serves me correctly, the Gallup poll sustains the President in refusing to be stampeded into an invasion of Cuba. The President certainly has tried very hard to resolve this problem and 63 percent of the people of America said the other day through a Gallup poll that they are opposed and are against any invasion of Cuba at this time. So it would appear to me that the President is certainly reading the mood of the people of this country a lot better than those who have been making big speeches here trying to goad him into some sort of military action in Cuba.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, if time permits, I would like to go along for just a few minutes to discuss what I consider the damaging effect of this sort of approach. I do not think it is the function of the Congress to have to pass a dozen laws every day. Some people have pointed out, and I think quite wisely, that oftentimes it is better not to legislate than it is to legislate.

Congress has a wide variety of functions. We have been able to move into these difficult days in which we live, I believe, quite ably and quite well.

Just think of the fact that 10 years ago there was not even such a thing as a space program. I saw the distinguished chairman of that committee walk on this floor a minute ago. We had to go out and hire experts who were able to advise us and consult with us and give us information about such a program as the space program. The distinguished Speaker of this House of Representatives had much to do with the creation of that committee.

This has nothing to do with partisanship. We have had to move into this period of fantastic weaponry such as the hydrogen bomb and nuclear energy and all of these other aspects, and I think the Congress by and large is entirely adequate.

I remember at this time last year that we had all this business about the 87th Congress being described as a "do nothing" Congress. Yet, I noticed there

was inserted in the RECORD a few days ago by the gentleman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] an article which appeared in one of the local newspapers on Sunday last entitled "Congress Has Been Maligned."

I am not going to read that article to you, but I commend it to your attention regardless of what position you may take. Incidentally, the gentleman from New York, I suppose, as a member of the Republican Party, did not vote for many of these programs which are set out in this article, but I will read you just a word or two. It says:

The daily reports of the 87th Congress made it appear to many as a catastrophe.

That is true. I remember reading those reports just as you remember reading them.

It reads:

Yet with a hindsight view of its accomplishments, we can judge it a smashing success. In the area of foreign and security affairs, Congress approved the defense buildup, the Peace Corps, the Disarmament Agency, the Alliance for Progress, an expansion of the food-for-peace program and the important Trade Act.

In the domestic area, it passed among others, the most comprehensive housing program in our history; the area redevelopment, manpower retraining; and emergency public works programs; an increase in the minimum wage to \$1.25; expansion of the social security system, including lowering the male retirement age to 62; complete revision of the public assistance programs; an increase in postal rates; revision of civil service and other Federal salary systems—

And so forth. I could add the drug bill and the satellite program and countless other programs.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STINSON. Did the gentleman ask the gentleman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] or did he tell her that he was going to use her name this afternoon?

Mr. BOGGS. No, I did not; but I did not use her name unfavorably. The gentleman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] is a very good friend of mine and has been for a long time. I did not want to imply that she had voted for or against some of these things.

Mr. STINSON. The gentleman said that she voted against some of these programs.

Mr. BOGGS. I said that I presumed she voted against them. I repeat that the gentleman from New York is one of my very close friends and I admire her very much.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. STAGGERS. I commend the gentleman from Louisiana for his brilliant discussion here today, and I would like to say with reference to these questions that I agree with him that it does not become a national magazine to get into this kind of interrogation in any way.

I would like to remind the gentleman from Louisiana and the Members of this Congress that this is the only

body I know of on earth in which if a vacancy occurs it cannot be filled either by appointment or succession, for we are responsible only to the residents of our districts. We are not responsible to the President of the United States. Our first responsibility is to the people of our districts to do what they want us to do. If we were responsible to the President, we would just be rubber-stamps and the people would not need us here to represent them.

I am not always in favor of everything the President suggests, but I always will support the principles of my party. I may vote against some of his propositions, but I will stand by the principles of my party.

This President of ours has inherited more problems than any President in the history of America or any man in the long span of history, and I think that he has acted with vision, sometimes ahead of most of the Members of this Congress here in the House of Representatives and in the other body. I believe that history will put him in the place that he has earned, that of a great leader not only of America but of the free world. I believe that when history is written he will go down as one of the great Presidents of these United States. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. BOGGS. Some of us here have traveled about and seen some other parliamentary bodies, even the alleged sedate House of Commons in London; and I have had opportunity to compare whatever you will, the efficiency, the dedication, the ability of the average Member of the House of Representatives, yes, and the ethics—and I do not care whether he be Republican or Democrat—with other members of parliamentary bodies, and I think that in every category we would compare favorably.

You have heard the uproars in some of these legislative bodies. I have sat in the gallery of the Chamber of Deputies in Paris and watched what I considered sheer disorder, something that would appall a Member of this body. I have seen things happen which no American Representative would dream of doing.

So in many ways what this really in effect constitutes is an attack upon the free institution of Congress itself which is the ultimate safeguard of the liberties of the people of the United States of America.

As some persons have so well said and what all of us at times have said, the President of the United States does not need anyone to defend him; he does very well himself.

I remember our late Speaker Rayburn saying in times of stress—and in this case he was referring to a Republican President, President Eisenhower—but I have heard him refer oftentimes to that President and other Presidents and say: "Either he is my leader and the leader of the United States of America or we have no leader."

This does not mean you have to acquiesce in everything the President is for, not by any stretch of the imagination, but there is a difference between total obstruction and opposition just because it comes from a person of an opposite

party, and constructive loyal opposition, as the expression is used elsewhere in the world.

One of the proudest documents I have is a letter written by President Eisenhower in which he gave me some credit for the enactment of the trade agreements program of his administration. I am proud of that letter, and I am happy that I was able to make some small contribution to the passage of that bill which he considered vital to his administration.

The President of the United States cannot be right about everything; but, on the contrary, he cannot be wrong about everything either. I must say that I get a little bit annoyed at people who are able to find that De Gaulle is right about everything; that Diefenbaker is right about everything; and even Mr. Tshombe is right about everything, but the President of the United States is wrong about everything.

They talk about people whom we work with who come from the White House. There is a certain implication in this. I have known Larry O'Brien for a long time. He, too, does not need anybody to defend him. I invite any member of the opposition to indicate to me any time where he has been unfair, where the thing he did was not right and what a man in his position was required to do and should do, if there is to be comity between the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

As far as I am personally concerned, all that Americans require of a public official, regardless of party, and from those instruments which go to make public policy—namely, the press, newspapers, radio, editorialists—is that all of us act responsibly.

I do not know of a single Member of this body who does not know how to act irresponsibly. It is so easy to do. I do not know of anyone who does not know how to join in the public clamor, whatever it may be.

The only monument on the Capitol Grounds is erected to a former Republican Member of the Congress of the United States, the other body. I refer to the distinguished former Senator from Ohio, Senator Taft.

One of the things for which that monument ultimately came to him was the fact he stood alone in the other body and said he would be against drafting workers into the Army to run the railroads, despite the fact that this body had voted for it, with only a few dissenting votes.

The point I make is: it is difficult to act responsibly at times, but it is important to act responsibly. We have the greatest nation on earth and the freest nation on earth. The way to lose it is to be irresponsible, and it is just as bad for a journalistic enterprise to be irresponsible as it is for you, me, or any other person who is charged with some responsibility.

#### CUBAN REFUGEE AGITATION AND RIOTING SHOULD NOT HAPPEN AGAIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RYAN of New York). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from

Florida [Mr. FASCELL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, 1963, and again on February 26, 1963, I addressed the Members of this body with reference to the problems that have arisen in Miami and south Florida with the Cuban refugees.

At that time I called the Members' attention to a riot between the Cuban refugees and local police authority at about 10 a.m. February 21.

At the session of February 21, I spread on the RECORD the stories of this uncalled for outburst as they were carried on the wires of the Associated Press and United Press.

At the session of February 26, I re-spread on the RECORD these same wire stories and included for the RECORD a story written by Milt Sosin, a reporter of the Cox newspapers for the Miami News, wherein he ably presented the story of this tragic and untimely incident. There was also spread on the RECORD an editorial from a Knight newspaper, the Miami Herald, dated February 26, titled "No Right To Riot."

The day before the appearance of the four or five picketing members of the Committee for Nonviolent Action in front of the Cuban Revolutionary Council headquarters in Miami, and the ensuing riotous action of the Cuban refugees, the editorial staff of the Miami News, in the evening edition of February 20, 1963, carried the following editorial comment:

#### REFUGEES SHOULD IGNORE PEACE AGITATORS

The Committee for Nonviolent Action seems determined to keep busy until it stirs up a little violent action.

What these extreme pacifists hope to accomplish by announcing—2 days in advance—that pickets will parade tomorrow in front of the Cuban Revolutionary Council headquarters is not too hard to understand. The refugee would only be playing into their hands by marching against the pickets in force.

The Cuban radio announcer who urged the demonstration against the pickets showed poor judgment. A riot on Biscayne Boulevard would end a 4-year record of peaceful assimilation by the Cubans into the community, a record remarkably free of violence.

There is no disposition here to come out against peace, nor against the right of people to assemble or picket for special causes, no matter how unpopular or extreme the causes.

But we think the Committee for Nonviolent Action has tipped its hand in electing to taunt a refugee population that is understandably edgy and which has no vote in the political matters that interest the committee.

This committee is out to make propaganda for a program which, if followed along its unlikely course, would leave the United States unarmed and defenseless against communism. Their exploitation of the Cuban refugees is calloused and cruel, and the refugees would be smart to ignore them.

On February 20, 1963, the day prior to the pacifist picketing of the Cuban

Refugee Council headquarters, Ralph Renick, vice president in charge of news at WTVJ, channel 4, Miami, issued the following TV editorial:

The National Committee for Nonviolent Action has been provoking violent action by staging demonstrations in Miami Shores, Coral Gables, and Homestead Air Force Base. Tomorrow the committee members intend to set up shop outside the headquarters of the Cuban Revolutionary Council. It should be said that these people claim they hate nobody. They just want the United States to disarm and disband our military services. The theory is we can trust the Communists to do the same and therefore peace will reign forevermore. This would be great except the Communists have openly demonstrated and stated their intention to take over this little world of ours by whatever means necessary, including deceit and lies. The only thing they can be trusted to do is be untrustworthy.

These pickets are irritating—but the best thing to do is to do nothing; just ignore them. To do otherwise would play into their hands.

On February 21, 1963, Ralph Renick, vice president in charge of news, WTVJ channel 4, Miami, and their Latin news editor, Manolo Reyes, issued the following TV editorial comment:

#### CUBAN RIOTS: WHY IT SHOULDN'T HAVE HAPPENED

What happened at Biscayne Boulevard and 17th Street this morning is deplorable. Riot action of any kind can only give a city a black eye and considering the tense state of Caribbean affairs at the moment, a riot in Miami is bound to create undue fear elsewhere that it is somehow unsafe to visit here.

We should like to note that channel 4 in its twice-daily Spanish language news program pleaded for all Cuban exiles to stay clear of the revolutionary council headquarters where the pacifist picketing was to take place.

Last night and this morning, Mayor High appeared on the program, speaking in Spanish, telling Cuban residents to ignore the picketing.

There are probably 150,000 Cubans here—149,700 heeded this advice. The 300 that didn't are guilty of giving all of their fellow exiles a black eye along with the city.

What happened should never have happened. Miami police and firemen are to be commended for efficiently handling a volatile situation. It should be said that the revolutionary council and its leader, Dr. Jose Miro Cardona, did little to prevent the gathering of the mob nor to quell the action which followed at its headquarters.

Channel 4 Latin News Editor Manolo Reyes, on WTVJ's program "News En Espanol," later tonight and tomorrow morning, will carry an editorial addressed to the Cubans saying "the law comes before the will of men and no one is authorized to take justice by his own hand. The law is to be respected above all personal prejudice or emotion or justified anger."

Reyes deplores the fact that a minority group of Cubans fell into the trap made by a group of pacifists. He called upon the Cubans to "think with their head and not their heart."

It is time for Miami's Cuban colony to develop a form of leadership which can exert self-discipline. To do otherwise will gravitate this community to an explosive state of human relations which will hurt the exiles, the town and its permanent population.

These timely and well-stated words of warning, unfortunately, went unheeded. Nonetheless, they bear repeating lest some other persons with



misguided, or possibly purposeful intentions, again attempt to rile the emotions of persons who have been angered and oppressed by the Communist tyranny within their homeland, Cuba.

In our great country, within the framework of our democracy, we provide that each citizen shall have the basic right to agree or disagree, or present his views, publicly or otherwise, by peaceful means.

These are the rights which the Communist would have us destroy.

The Cuban refugee would do well to remember that had he, and other persons oppressed by tyrannical governments ruled from extremes of either the right or the left, been permitted the right to think, speak, and act peacefully, without fear of governmental reprisal, he might not have found himself today, nor during prior governmental regimes, the victim of oppression.

They would do well to remember that in our democracy, we settle our differences through judicial, peaceful means rather than with emotional and riotous outbursts.

Those who demonstrate for peace would similarly do well to remember that they may well be aiding the cause of communism and those who would overthrow the Government—that peace cannot be found through public actions that tend to incite riot—nor those actions that prey upon the emotions of refugees from oppression.

The incident of February 21 should not have occurred and should not happen again.

#### CUBAN REFUGEES RESPONSIBILITY OF ENTIRE NATION—NOT JUST SOUTH FLORIDA

Mr. Speaker, through January 25, 1963, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reports they have resettled 53,974 Cuban refugees from Miami, Dade County, Fla., to other parts of the United States. This is not quite one-third of the 157,525 persons who had entered the United States and registered at Miami from Cuba.

Untold numbers of Cuban refugees who entered the Miami area did not register. Therefore, the 157,525 Cuban refugees figure is not entirely accurate. Reliable sources estimate the actual number of Cuban refugees entering the south Florida area at 200,000 or more.

Whether the figure is 105,000 or 155,000 Cuban refugees still remaining in Miami is immaterial.

The point is that there are well over 100,000, in fact maybe as many as 200,000 Cuban refugees, still in the Greater Miami, Fla., community; an area which had a population of only 1 million.

No community, no matter how large, could withstand the almost immediate impact of a 10- to 20-percent increase in population; the number of persons bringing about this increase being penniless and destitute without homes, clothing, food, in many cases without friends, with little or no knowledge of the English language, and all unemployed.

The situation is worsened by the fact that there already existed in Dade County, Fla., a serious unemployment problem—so much so that the U.S. Department of Labor and the Area Rede-

velopment Administration had long ago found that there were a sufficient number of unemployed American citizens so as to qualify Dade County as a class D labor surplus market area.

The result: The American citizens of south Florida were thrown into open competition with the Cuban refugees for the very limited number of jobs available.

The Cuban refugee, in desperate straits, was willing to work for ridiculously low wages. Employers in a distressed State, seeking to keep their economic heads above water, engaged the refugee at a lesser wage, and an American thereby became unemployed. Approximately 30,000 Cuban refugees are employed in the Miami area.

The laboring classes—and the Negro particularly—suffered from the influx of the refugees who entered in large numbers in the field of domestic work, light manufacturing, and the many other areas of nonskilled as well as professional labor. They had no Cuban refugee center to turn to when their jobs were gone and their funds expired. Often, he became the refugee—pulling up stakes before his funds ran completely out; some left Florida and went to areas foreign to them in search of work.

We are all well aware of the tremendous sum of money that the Federal Government has pumped into the Dade County area to assist with the Cuban refugee situation. Without this Federal financial assistance, the community might well have been substantially more economically distressed.

The Greater Miami-Dade County area has opened its arms and its pocketbooks to these refugees and has done and will continue to do everything humanly possible to assist them to maintain their livelihood and their honor.

However, the situation in Miami obviously did not result from foreign policy actions of the Floridians. The responsibility is that of the entire Nation. Uttering nice words about the wonderful way in which the Miami area have reacted to the situation was, and is, no substitute for more equitable actions—actions of other cities and States and the Federal Government to share in greater proportion a burden which is theirs as well.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I want to commend the gentleman on the forceful and fair manner in which he is bringing this problem to the House and to commend his city on the tremendous job it has done in dealing with these people who are refugees from a tyranny that seeks to threaten the United States. I think the job has national implications, and I think the gentleman in pointing up its national implications is doing a service to this country as well as to his own constituents.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman. This is one purpose of my remarks as I have made them from time to time on this subject on the floor of this House; also I seek the continued assist-

ance of our House Democratic leadership, which has assisted us so generously as it has other areas which have a similar unemployment problem.

Along with the majority of Congress, I have strongly supported some administration policies dealing with the economic plight of our American citizens whether in West Virginia, Florida, Pennsylvania, Detroit, or some other State. I want to advise any Member of Congress if he wants to listen to me that all it takes is for serious economic distress to happen to you one time, to your district and your people, and as you see other economically distressed areas around the country, you will decide quickly that your problem is not one for the community to take care of by itself.

Every day here in Congress we have to draw a line regarding each issue we confront. Sure, it is easy to be in political opposition to anything. We all know that. That is no trick. But blind political opposition is also the height of irresponsibility. But in the stand we individually take on every issue there is a right place to draw a line based on our own criteria and responsible judgment, whether our decision is based on what we responsibly believe is the national interest, the national security, the desires of our constituents, or the principles of our party.

That is why I was very much interested in the remarks previously made here today by our distinguished majority whip on this question of blind political opposition and irresponsibility. It does not make any difference whether the Republicans are in power or the Democrats are in power, we have to recognize the problems in this country and then attempt to do the best within our ability and judgment to meet and solve those problems. There we are going to have arguments. There we are going to make political capital out of the differences which exist, as to how the country's needs should be met. That is part of the American political system. This is what we love, this is what we fight for.

But as was so ably stated by the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, our majority leader, Hon. CARL ALBERT, and also in the forceful remarks of the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. HALE BOGGS, the pattern of irresponsible political attack that seems to be emerging I call frightening, discouraging, I call disheartening, and I call downright dangerous. The pattern of irresponsibility is to attack blindly; attack the democratic institution of the Congress of the United States; attack it; weaken the confidence of the American people in the greatest democratic assemblage the world has ever known; destroy it; attack the Chief Executive of the United States; attack the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces; attack, destroy, and weaken the confidence of the American people in the ability of a democratic government to hold off the tyranny of communism; attack the Defense Department; weaken and destroy the confidence of the American people in the ability of our military people to exercise the proper judgment and to meet the challenges that we have to face; attack and destroy the State

Department; weaken the confidence of the American people in those who are responsible for carrying out the foreign policy decisions of the United States; attack the Supreme Court, abolish it, modify it, change its powers, weaken the confidence of the American people in the democratic institution of divided powers and authority.

Do all this—for political purposes? God forbid—but the dangerous pattern faintly but clearly emerges out of the cloud of irresponsible political venom filling the air.

Do all this—to accomplish what?

Win the Congress? Win the White House? Throw out the "ins"?

Let us have our political opposition. Let us have our political fights. Let us draw the lines on the issues. Let us call them very clearly to the attention of the American people. But let us be responsible and preserve, not attack, our democratic institutions. Let us be responsible and then go to our own people and let them decide who should carry on.

Mr. Speaker, it is in this context that I bring to this body today the problems that exist in my area with respect to the Cuban refugees who are fleeing the tyranny of communism in Cuba.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I want to associate myself very strongly with the sentiments expressed by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] and to ask him whether in that part of his remarks which I did not hear he called attention to the fact that the gentleman and I have planned to hold hearings within a few days in Miami and to have all the agencies of the Federal Government that have to do with the relocation program of the Cuban refugees present with us and to let them, in our presence, hear the sentiment of the people of our country as to the impact, economic and otherwise, of the Cuban refugees upon our economy. Did my distinguished colleague cover that in his very able remarks?

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the distinguished gentleman, who is my able colleague from my former district. I did not include that in my remarks and I am very happy that the gentleman made mention of it. I want to take this opportunity, by the way, since I have not had the opportunity before, to say I am delighted that my district has been split in half and that you now so ably represent the other half. I also want to say here on the record that from the day you have been here you have interested yourself ably in this problem and have exercised great leadership and knowledge with respect to it. I know that we can solve this problem. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank my colleague.

#### MINNESOTA TACONITE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RYAN of New York). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Min-

nesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, all of us in this body are concerned, as are our colleagues in the other body, with the problems of our country's depressed areas. All of us are disturbed by the continuing problem of serious unemployment in this country. We are concerned with proper solutions to the problems of these economically unfortunate areas, and many of us recognize that the best solutions lie in the efforts of private citizens, private associations, and companies, and the efforts of local and State governments.

In this connection, there is about to be written in the State of Minnesota a successful conclusion to an effort to properly bring to northeastern Minnesota the economic health which that area of the State and of the country deserves to enjoy. That success story is not the result of action by the Federal Government, but rather it stems from concerted activity by municipal and local government officials, by the executive and legislative branches of the Minnesota State government, and by officials of the United States Steel Corp. and the United Steelworkers.

Mr. Speaker, as a Congressman from the State of Minnesota I desire to inform the House of Representatives of an issue of vital importance to the people of economically depressed northeastern Minnesota, indeed to the entire State of Minnesota, and to the Nation. That issue is taconite, and the related attempt to add a taconite tax amendment to the Minnesota State constitution. The argument for the amendment had been arrived at only after careful study and analysis. I should like to present some of the background of this proposal.

For more than three-quarters of a century, Minnesota and iron ore have been linked together. Since 1884, when the Soudan Mine was opened on the Vermilion Range, iron mining has played a major role in Minnesota's economy.

Vermilion Range iron mining operations were much like those of Michigan and other areas—underground mining for the most part. But when the great Mesabi Range began to sprout mining camps, a revolution was about to begin in the American iron and steel business. Never before had iron ore of such rich quality been attainable so easily from open pits.

The Mesabi Range began to produce ore shortly after 1890 when iron ore was discovered near Iron Mountain, Minn. Further discoveries near Biwabik led to the construction of the Duluth, Mesabi, and Northern Railroad line in 1892, when the first Mesabi ore was shipped to dockside in Duluth.

The Mesabi Range proved to be far larger than any of its discoverers had ever dreamed. Within a few years after

1892, the ore—chiefly soft hematite—was discovered all the way from Babbitt on the east to Grand Rapids, 110 miles to the southwest. Then when ore shipments from the Cuyuna Range began to flow down the Great Lakes in 1911, Minnesota's position as the world's foremost iron ore producer was assured.

As mining methods improved, and with the demands of World War I and the economic growth that followed it in the 1920's, Minnesota's importance as a source of iron ore steadily grew. By 1940, Minnesota had produced more than 1.2 billion tons of iron ore. Indeed, Minnesota had the lion's share of the iron ore market.

World War II brought an even greater demand for Minnesota ore, and during the 5 war years, Minnesota's mining industry produced over 338 million tons of ore—ore for all but a minute percentage of our war armaments. And the next 5 years saw only a slight lessening of the need for Minnesota-produced ore, with 295 million tons being shipped.

Then came the Korean war and the prosperity of the 1950's—a time during which Minnesota had its biggest ore-producing years—79 million tons in 1951, a Korean war year, and 81 million tons in 1953. These were good years for Minnesota and its iron mining industry, good years for iron miners and their communities.

Today, however, conditions are much different. Minnesota no longer has a monopoly on iron ore sources. In fact, our largest fields of rich, pure ore are close to being depleted. Ore today is being produced in dozens of different places, all of which compete with our Minnesota ore. While Minnesota's share of the iron ore market has declined, the State has been unable to keep pace with other areas in attracting investments for iron ore products.

#### PROBLEMS FOR MINNESOTA ORE PRODUCERS

Actually, Minnesota's iron ore problem can be traced to a number of different causes—all of which have contributed to the overall problem. The problem, basically, is that Minnesota no longer dominates the market for iron ore as it previously has. The reason for this loss of hold on the market is that other areas can produce ore of equal or better quality at an equal or lower cost. If iron ore cannot compete on the quality-cost front, then it cannot sell, and if it does not sell, there are no opportunities for jobs. This is the current problem—demand for high-quality ore at a reasonable and competitive cost.

It would seem reasonable to assume that iron ore produced in Minnesota should cost approximately the same as iron ore produced elsewhere in the Nation, if not in the world when added to shipping costs, but it does not. Iron ore, depending on its quality and structure, sells for a certain price in a competitive market. This does not mean, however, that all iron ore producers make the same profit on their ore, because it may cost a producer in one place more to mine and treat the ore than it does a producer in another. The Minnesota iron ore producer may have higher costs



than his counterpart in, say, Michigan, Missouri, Canada, or Venezuela.

In Minnesota, as elsewhere, taxes are a cost to be met. Full and true value is supposed to be the market value of the property if it were to be sold. In practice, however, assessors do not value property in this way. According to the Minnesota Department of Taxation, the average full and true value of real property in Minnesota as valued by assessors amounts to only 34.2 percent of the property's actual market value.

The practice of undervaluing property is common throughout the State. This practice does not apply, though, in the case of iron ore. Iron ore is valued by the State Department of Taxation. It is not valued by local assessors. Drill cores and other data taken from the various mining properties are reported to the School of Mines of the University of Minnesota. The School of Mines then reports the tonnage figures and the quality analysis of the ore to the Commissioner of Taxation. He then values the ore at 100 percent of its market value.

It has been argued that these differences in assessment practices mean that there are great discrepancies between the valuation of mineral and nonmineral properties. They point to the average valuation of nonmineral property in St. Louis County, which is 20 percent of market value and where most of the mines are located, comparing it to mineral properties, which are valued at 100 percent of market value.

This combination of factors—the higher assessment rate, and the undervaluing of nonmineral property—means that iron mining companies are required to pay up to 20 times more in property tax dollars than nonmining properties of the same value.

Higher State and local taxes for mining have been upheld by the natural heritage theory, a position which holds that removal of an irreplaceable raw material should be taxed higher than other products. Local governments and the State government have looked to iron ore as a major source of tax revenues, and both political parties for years have based this policy on the natural heritage theory.

Basically, there are three taxes on iron ore in Minnesota. There is the ad valorem, or general property tax, the occupation tax, and the royalty tax. The ad valorem tax is a general property tax levied against real and personal property, with certain exemptions, and requires that mined and unmined ore be assessed at 50 percent of the appraised full and true value. Other property in Minnesota is assessed at rates ranging from 40 percent of full and true value down to 10 percent.

The occupation tax is not designed to tax profits like the corporation income tax, but instead, it is a tax on the occupation of mining—a tax to be paid for the right to do business in Minnesota.

The occupation tax was established 40 years ago when the people passed an amendment to the State constitution setting up a special tax for mining. There was some question at the time

regarding the legality of creating a special tax for iron mining which would have been different from that imposed on other business in the State, but on November 7, 1922, the occupation tax amendment passed by an overwhelming vote. At current levels, the occupation tax amounts to 14.25 percent of the value of the ore at the mouth of the mine, versus the present corporation income tax rate of 10.2 percent.

The third ore tax is a royalty tax. A royalty is a payment made by the mine operator to the owner of the land which is being mined. In Minnesota there is a tax on these payments. In other words the mine operator pays twice, once to the landowner, and again to the State in the form of a tax on the royalty payment.

#### TACONITE: WHAT IS IT?

Taconite first attracted the interest of an early prospector named Peter Mitchell. Mitchell traveled through northeastern Minnesota in 1869, 1870, and 1871, and sank some test pits in the Babbitt area. While Mitchell felt that taconite offered great promise, 80 years were to pass before taconite began to show real signs of fulfilling that promise.

Taconite is the basic rock of the Mesabi iron formation. It is a sedimentary deposit laid down, according to some estimates, around 1 billion years ago. The vast deposits of taconite, stretching from Babbitt on the east to Grand Rapids on the southwest, underwent a number of physical changes over the millions of years of its formation. On the eastern end of the Mesabi Range some hot, molten material flowed from the earth near the taconite deposits, and the tremendous heat baked the rock, giving it its extreme hardness and also converting its iron content from hematite to magnetite. Elsewhere, along the formation, where the taconite was not so hard, the forces of nature broke up the taconite in certain areas allowing ground waters and erosion to carry away silicate and other impurities. It was this action which formed the natural iron ore deposits of the Mesabi Range.

Taconite, then, is the iron-bearing formation of the Mesabi Range. For the most part, it contains only 25 to 30 percent iron, in the form of tiny particles, spread through the taconite. Taconite derives its name from the Taconic Mountains of western Massachusetts. A geologist noted similarities between the two areas and named the material taconite.

Today taconite is often called an ore, but for years it was considered to be too low in iron content to be an ore. Taconite has been referred to as "lean and mean." Since taconite is not very high in iron content, it received little attention. The direct shipping ores of the Mesabi were being developed, and no one had much time for the supposedly inferior product.

There were a few, however, who did see great potentials in taconite, and among these few was a young electrical engineer at the University of Minnesota, E. W. Davis. Davis worked, experimentally, with magnetic taconite from the Mesabi Range. He developed a labora-

tory device which could separate the magnetic iron ore particles from the waste material in the taconite, and he worked to develop methods of breaking up the hard, stubborn rock.

As the years passed Davis continued his work at the mines experiment station of the University's School of Mines, as did various mining companies and private research organizations. In the 1930's, two mining companies were formed for the possible development of taconite. They were Reserve Mining Co. and Erie Mining Co.

Then, in 1941, the Minnesota Legislature passed a bill which was to have far-reaching effect upon Minnesota's taconite potential. Again Davis played an important role in this effort. The bill for the taconite tax law passed the conservative house and senate, and was signed into law by Republican Gov. Harold Stassen. The purpose of the law was to stimulate development of taconite processing. Its effect is widely known. Taconite companies moved ahead with their plans, secured investment money approaching half a billion dollars in total, and proceeded with construction work.

Taconite developments in Minnesota, and the development of similar mineral resources in other areas do require vast amounts of investment in money. Insofar as the American steel industry's interest in domestic and continental ores is concerned, attention seems to have been shifted from direct shipping high grade ores—of which there is a rapidly dwindling supply now known in the United States—to low-grade ores, of which we have great abundance. With such great and scattered supplies of these low-grade ores available, competition is keen for investment money to develop local projects.

While it is true that Minnesota in prior years virtually monopolized the American iron ore market, it is equally true today that Minnesota's share of this market has drastically declined. In 1950, for example, Minnesota mines supplied 62 percent of the iron ore used in the American steel industry, while other U.S. areas supplied 30 percent, and foreign imports supplied but 8 percent. However, by 1960, Minnesota's share had fallen to but 47 percent; other U.S. areas went down to 24 percent, but foreign imports jumped to 29 percent.

In analyzing the reasons for this Minnesota decline, the same two factors mentioned previously stand out—cost and quality. Mining officials say that taxes, as a part of their costs, discourage investors from making capital available for Minnesota ore projects in the taconite field. It is argued that vast tonnages of high-quality and taconite-type ores in other States and nations makes it mandatory for Minnesota to improve both its ore product and its tax structure if it is to be competitive once again in the iron ore market, in which Canadian, Brazilian, Peruvian, Venezuelan, and Liberian producers are now active, as well as other American States.

Taconite operations in Minnesota currently employ about 5,000 persons. Since taconite operations continue through the winter months, these—un-

like high-grade ore positions—are year-round jobs. Naturally, enlargement of Minnesota's taconite industry would not produce economic solvency for the area immediately. But from the ground breaking for a new plant right on through the start of production, growth would come gradually and increase rapidly in an area that today has one of the highest percentages of unemployment and economic depression in the Nation. The raw materials are there—the product, and the workers, but the product needs developing, and the men need jobs.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce in 1956 prepared a study which shows that for every 100 new factory workers in a community, there are 296 more people, 112 more households, 51 more school-children, \$590,000 more in personal income every year, \$270,000 more in bank deposits, 107 more passenger cars registered, 174 more workers employed, 4 more retail establishments, and \$360,000 more in retail sales per year.

#### PRESENT TACONITE TAXES IN MINNESOTA

State and local taxes on taconite operations differ from those on natural iron ore operations. The taconite tax law passed by the legislature in 1941 exempted taconite from the ad valorem taxes paid by other mining companies. Instead, a tonnage tax was imposed amounting to 5 cents for each gross ton of taconite concentrate. An additional one-tenth of a cent is imposed for each 1 percent of iron content in the concentrate in excess of 55 percent. This production tax amounts to between 5 and 6 cents per ton of taconite concentrate, since Minnesota taconite products contain about 62 percent iron.

The taconite tax is paid in lieu of ad valorem taxes, although taconite companies are required to pay a property tax of \$1 per acre on lands containing unmined taconite. The taconite tax is basically designed to support local units of government.

Taconite companies in Minnesota are also required to pay a railroad gross earnings tax of 5 percent. Both Erie Mining Co. and Reserve Mining Co. own their own railroad facilities which are used to haul crude taconite or taconite pellets. The law provides that the gross earnings of these railroads are defined as a "sum of money equal to the amount which would be charged under established tariffs of common carriers for the transportation of an equal tonnage of iron ore from Mesabi Range ports at the head of Lake Superior.

The revenue from this tax amounts to 7.4 cents per gross ton of taconite concentrate, and it is distributed in the same way as the taconite tax.

Taconite companies which have had to build new communities also pay additional tax levies for local purposes. More than \$13 million in special levies against taconite operations have been passed by various legislative sessions during the past 6 years. These levies have been passed with the support of taconite companies themselves. In addition taconite companies, in building new communities, have paid for the installation of streets, sewers, water treatment plants, recreational facilities, and other items which

would normally be paid by property owners.

Taconite companies pay State occupation and royalty taxes. The rate, however, is lower than it is for natural ore producers. When the legislature added the surtax on the occupation tax, taconite operations were not included. Therefore, the basic rate of the occupation tax on taconite operations is 11 percent of the value of the product at the plant. The basic rate of the royalty tax, likewise, is 11 percent. Added to this basic rate for the occupation and royalty tax, is 1 percent for the veterans bonus. Labor credits can be applied against both the occupation and royalty taxes, as they can with natural ore operations.

A special tax law was written during the 1959 session of the Minnesota Legislature to provide for the taxation of semitaconite. The semitaconite tax is quite similar to the taconite production tax, and revenues from it are distributed in the same way as the taconite tax. This tax law was developed to encourage research and investment in the development of semitaconite, another low-grade ore resource found on the western end of the Mesabi Range.

#### THE TACONITE AMENDMENT: ITS NEED

In the summer of 1960, a group of northeastern Minnesota mayors proposed that something be done to help the distressed condition of the Iron Range where thousands of men had been and still are unemployed, some for 3 or 4 years. Their suggestion came in the form of a proposed amendment to the State constitution which would establish the principle that the taxes imposed upon taconite would be kept in balance with taxes on other industry in the State.

Elmer L. Andersen, then Republican candidate for Governor in 1960, proposed a similar idea during the course of the campaign. In his tax message to the legislature on February 6, 1961, Governor Andersen urged the legislators, as part of the tax program, to "adopt a constitutional amendment that will assure firms engaged in taconite production that their taxes will not exceed those of manufacturing and other industrial concerns. This is simply an assurance of equality, and not a grant of special privilege nor a freezing of tax rates."

On March 24, 1961, the taconite tax amendment was introduced in the legislature. As the Minneapolis Tribune reported the next day:

Its [the bill's] purpose is to allay the fears of the industry that, if more high-cost plants are built to process lower grade ores, the legislature will single them out for higher taxes. Occupation revenues are expected to drop as high-grade ore production fades.

The regular session bill sought to spur taconite construction plants by specifying that the amendment, if approved, would not become effective until such time as the total capacity of the industry in the State reached 19.5 million tons. It presently is about 17 million. The amendment stated that combined royalty, excise, and occupation taxes imposed on the processing of taconite and semitaconite shall not exceed the taxes

computed under present ore tax laws or under income tax laws, whichever are greater.

On April 13, 1961, the liberal-controlled Minnesota House Tax Committee adjourned without taking action on the bill. The committee chairman, apparently motivated by political ambition and the fear that the Republican Governor would be given credit for this piece of legislation, said he planned no more meetings of the committee in the regular session. The vote on the motion for adjournment followed strict party lines, as did the vote killing the bill. The previous Tuesday the conservative-controlled Minnesota Senate Tax Committee had all but unanimously approved the measure.

With the defeat of the bill in the house, the matter was temporarily dropped in capitol halls, but it was soon to come up again. In the meantime, the full fury of an aroused electorate was to be felt in the St. Paul mayoralty election.

The amendment had originated with the nonpolitical Northeastern Minnesota Mayors Association, many members of which are lifelong Democrats. Republican Gov. Elmer L. Andersen and strong Republican Party support gave the bill a truly bipartisan flavor. The amendment dealt only with State taxes, leaving local tax policies to the communities. It simply recognized that times have changed in the mining industry, and the industry was building in States which were willing to take action to stimulate investment. The amendment was to be Minnesota's demonstration of its desire to successfully compete with its sister States and foreign nations.

Liberal State legislators and the Democrat-Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota argued that tax legislation should not be written into the State's constitution. Yet the amendment is needed because of a present constitutional provision passed in 1922 under which special mining taxes are now paid. That provision made it legal for iron mining in Minnesota to be taxed at a rate higher than other industry in the State. The proposed amendment would limit the effect the 1922 law has on taconite at the present time. Furthermore, there are presently 19 amendments and several other sections dealing with State fiscal matters in the present Minnesota State constitution.

These same groups further argued that there was no need for a constitutional amendment. If any change were needed, they maintained, a legislative statute certainly should be sufficient. The difference is both simple and far-reaching. A statute can be passed by one session of the legislature and repealed by the next, indeed passed and repealed by the same session if they so desired; while an amendment could certainly be repealed, it would take a vote of the people to do so, and is a much more permanent and stable assurance to the mining industry that they are both protected and the provision is going to stay on the books for a while. After the tax "bleeding" the industry underwent in Minnesota when the State had a



monopoly on its raw material, their concern is both valid and well justified.

A Minnesota poll of September 10, 1961, showed that 63 percent of all Minnesotans supported the amendment idea, including 55 percent of the Democrats, 76 percent of the Republicans, 71 percent of the Independents, and 64 percent of the labor union members. Since that time the percentage of voters supporting the idea has approached 70. Yet the amendment process continued to be opposed by leaders of the labor unions, the Democrat-Farmer-Labor Party, the Farmers Union, and other liberal-Democrat-Farmer-Labor oriented groups.

On April 25, 1961, Governor Andersen called the legislature into special session. On that date, in an address before the legislature, the Governor said:

Failure to give our people a chance to vote on a constitutional amendment designed only to assure those engaged in processing taconite and semitaconite to taxation equal to that imposed on other industry could be a tragic mistake. Adoption of this amendment could well be the signal for ore processing development assuring jobs for thousands. There is so much to gain, the assurance is so minimal, the competition so keen, I find your hesitation incredible.

On May 8 testimony began on the controversial amendment before the house tax committee. The bill in the special session was the same as the one in the regular session except for the restrictions as to the effect and the date it should go into effect.

By late afternoon on May 11, the committee had heard all those wishing to speak on the bill and were ready to take the vote. The liberal-Democrat-Farmer-Labor leadership, who had been a stumbling block in the regular session, moved to lay the bill on the table. The vote was taken and, almost on straight party lines, the motion passed 16 to 10, thus killing the bill again.

In December of 1961 the Governor once more called a special legislative session, this time a 2-day affair to accomplish congressional redistricting which the Democrat-Farm-Labor-liberal caucus in the legislature had also blocked during the regular and first special session. Again Governor Andersen and the Minnesota Republican Party joined with northeastern Minnesota and statewide civic groups in urging the legislature to put the taconite amendment on the ballot in the 1962 general election. "Just give the people the right to vote," they urged. But again the opposition held their stubborn ground. Again the proposal did not carry the day.

As the 1962 Minnesota State and legislative campaigns grew more heated, the taconite issue played an ever-increasing role in the campaign oratory; Republicans and conservatives were for, Democrat-Farmer-Laborite and liberals were against. The people wanted the right to vote on the amendment. Not receiving that privilege, they vented their anger on many legislators who had prevented them from doing so. Both houses of the Minnesota Legislature are now controlled by the conservatives, the liberals having lost control of the State house for the first time since 1955.

While not as certain as the control of the legislature, it also would appear that the people of Minnesota are finally going to get the right to vote on the taconite tax amendment. The present Minnesota Legislature seems certain to pass the amendment and put it on the November 1964 ballot. The district 33, United Steelworker's Council has endorsed the proposal, and the Democrat-Farmer-Laborite Party seems to be moving toward a compromise position on the matter. Regardless of the outcome of Minnesota's gubernatorial recount now in progress, it is to the lasting credit of Gov. Elmer L. Andersen that he stuck to his guns and that he has contributed greatly to date in bringing the taconite tax amendment to the threshold of victory.

As evidence of what this matter will mean to the State of Minnesota should it be approved by the State's electorate next November, I include herein the following statement made to the Minnesota House of Representatives yesterday by Mr. Christian F. Beukema, president of the Oliver Iron Mining Division of United States Steel Corp.:

#### STATEMENT OF CHRISTIAN F. BEUKEMA

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee; I welcome the opportunity to appear before your committee to urge favorable consideration of this important piece of legislation. As an official of a major producer of iron ore in Minnesota, I have previously discussed the importance of a favorable tax climate to the competitive position of Minnesota ores.

During the last several years substantial progress has been made in acquainting the people of Minnesota with the mining industry's problems at both the State and local levels and in acquiring their understanding toward reasonable solutions. A start has been made toward finding a solution to the very serious question of fairness in local tax valuations. With increased understanding and cooperation on the part of all concerned we believe more progress will be made in this very essential area so important to the competitive position of natural ores and taconites in Minnesota.

In the light of this belief in the progress made and faith in continued progress to be made on local tax matters, and in order that this committee, Minnesota's legislature and its people may be assured of the position of United States Steel Corp. and Oliver Iron Mining Division and of our desire and intention to continue as a major producer of iron ore in Minnesota, we wish to make the following statement:

We are convinced that the proposed constitutional amendment gives assurance to the taconite industry of an equitable tax climate at the State level and, if recommended to the voters by the legislature, will be approved in the referendum of November 1964. Promptly after the constitutional amendment has been so adopted, United States Steel Corp. will complete engineering and commence construction of a major taconite plant in the vicinity of Mountain Iron, Minn., of not less than 3 or 4 million tons capacity. The new plant will be so designed that it may be expanded readily.

This commitment is offered to assist the unification efforts of all sincerely concerned Minnesotans as they seek satisfactory solutions to the problem of assuring fair tax treatment for taconite and semitaconite. Substantial progress toward a bipartisan approach has already been made. The authorship and submission of this bill with committee sponsorship is one example.

Another example of progress toward a desirable solution is the forthright approach of District 33, United Steelworkers. Through understanding and cooperation with the industry, the United Steelworkers have contributed a practical approach to the issues involved in the constitutional debate. Opening the door to additional jobmaking investments which are so vital to the economic status of northeastern Minnesota is a matter of continuing importance and the position of United Steelworkers recognizes the serious import of this matter.

The deteriorating position of Minnesota natural ores in comparison with high quality ores from many sources has a consequent impact on both present employment and future expectations of employment. The local tax burdens which have been historically carried by natural ores are of such magnitude that they cannot be shifted to taconite and semitaconite if Minnesota is to encourage new investments in taconite plants of substantial capacities. The passage of the constitutional amendment will be reassuring to investors in taconite and will go far toward establishing for the Minnesota mining industry a more competitive position and related increased employment.

United States Steel Corp. believes that further clarification of its position at this time will be of benefit to those who wish to achieve a bipartisan support for the proposed amendment, to those seeking the advantages of taconite investments for the State of Minnesota, and to those whose jobs are dependent upon or benefit from iron ore production.

The commitment now to construct a taconite plant after adoption of this constitutional amendment by the voters at the end of 1964 naturally involves some uncertainties and the commitment must be subject to war, governmental or legal restrictions, or other unusual conditions beyond our control which may delay or prevent the consummation of such a program. With this necessary limitation, it is nevertheless a commitment which United States Steel Corp. willingly undertakes in the interest of all concerned.

This is a statement of major importance for Minnesota and its mining industry; its significance is indicated in the following article from the March 6, 1963, Wall Street Journal:

#### UNITED STATES STEEL PLANS TACONITE PLANT IN MINNESOTA—PROJECT HINGES ON ASSURANCE OF FAIR TAX TREATMENT; ISSUE MAY GO TO VOTERS—COST PUT AT OVER \$120 MILLION

ST. PAUL.—United States Steel Corp.'s Oliver Iron Mining Division said it plans to build a taconite plant near Mountain Iron, Minn., if what it considers fair tax treatment is assured.

Christian F. Beukema, division president, told the Minnesota house of representatives tax committee the company plans a facility "of not less than 3 or 4 million tons capacity" a year. Though he didn't discuss cost, it is estimated such a plant would cost between \$120 and \$160 million.

Taconite plants extract iron ore from flinty taconite rock and send it in pellet or powder form to steel mills. The low-grade taconite ore requires processing before it can be used.

The committee is considering an amendment to the State constitution which would guarantee the taconite industry that there would be no disproportionate rise in industry taxes for 20 years. Under present Minnesota law, taconite plants are taxed on a tonnage basis instead of under real estate levies applying to other industry. The amendment, if approved by the legislature, must be submitted to the voters.

"We are convinced that the proposed constitutional amendment gives assurance to

the taconite industry of an equitable tax climate at the State level and, if recommended to the voters by the legislature, will be approved in the referendum of November 1964," Mr. Beukema said.

Immediately after the amendment's adoption, he said, United States Steel will complete engineering and begin construction of the plant. The division has operated a 1-million-ton capacity pilot taconite plant at Mountain Iron since 1953.

Ford Motor Co. late last month said it is considering a taconite plant at Eveleth, Minn., in association with Oglebay Norton Co., a Cleveland mining company. The plant is understood to have a planned capacity of about 1.5 million tons a year. Erie Mining Co. and Reserve Mining Co., both owned by various steelmakers, have taconite plants in the State, and McLouth Steel Corp. has expressed interest in building one.

The Oliver official said the company's commitment "naturally involves some uncertainties and must be subject to war, governmental or legal restrictions or other unusual conditions beyond our control which may delay or prevent the consummation of such a program."

Walter E. Weber, vice president of Hanna Mining Co., told the committee Hanna is considering building a plant in Minnesota for processing semitaconite. The facility would have a capacity of 1.5 million to 2 million tons annually and cost \$30 to \$60 million, he said.

In Cleveland, Hanna officials said many aspects of the plans still had to be considered before the company moved ahead with the project.

Semitaconite is similar to taconite but requires a different processing method.

#### THE FEDERAL EXCISE TAX ON AUTOMOBILES

**THE SPEAKER pro tempore.** Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

**MR. CHAMBERLAIN.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

**THE SPEAKER pro tempore.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

**MR. CHAMBERLAIN.** Mr. Speaker, in his recent message to the Congress, the President said that tax reduction and reform is the most urgent task confronting the Congress in 1963. The announced objectives of the President's program are to step up the growth and vigor of our national economy—to increase job and investment opportunities—to improve our productivity.

Now that the initial effect of the President's proposals have given way to deeper reflection of specific provisions for tax reform, this whole program is encountering serious resistance. Many of the recommendations for so-called reforms are hard to justify and have only created confusion and controversy. The President himself has made the situation more puzzling when, in the face of a budget deficit of approximately \$12 billion this year, he appears to be retreating from his insistence for tax reform by indicating his willingness to accept a tax cut without tax revision.

In seeking a way to accomplish the urgent objective of spurring our econ-

omy, I simply cannot comprehend why the administration has given no consideration to the possibility of reducing or repealing the discriminatory 10 percent automobile excise tax which is imposed on the largest single segment of our economy. Not only has the administration ignored the possibility of excise tax reduction, but its recommendations to stimulate economic activity are based upon the premise that our largest industrial community should, in fact, continue to pay a temporary wartime tax that has no parallel in our entire tax structure.

As all of you must be quite aware, I have long advocated the repeal or reduction of this tax and now, with public discussions centering around the use of tax reduction as a stimulant to our economy, it seems to me that the climate has never been more appropriate, the stage was never so well set, to achieve this, and to give real impetus to our whole economy at the same time.

Year after year, I have vigorously protested the extension of this tax through every source available to me. I have spoken from the floor of the house, until some have dubbed me the "automobile horn of Congress"; I have inserted pertinent material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which I felt warranted serious study; I have written letters not only to my colleagues, but to many officials in the executive department; I have originated extensive research on the subject; and I have appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee whenever I have been permitted to do so.

Just recently my attention has been called to an analysis prepared last December by the Automobile Manufacturers Association, "The Federal Excise Tax on New Passenger Automobiles," which so clearly sets forth the many factors involved that I would like to have it included in the RECORD in its entirety.

I anticipate that it will not be many weeks before we will be called upon to act on recommendations for tax revision and also to extend our present excise taxes. With this in mind, I urge all of you to give this analysis your careful examination and study, for I am confident it will convince you that here is an opportunity to help fulfill the President's objective of stimulating our economy and, as I have said, correct a gross inequity in our tax structure:

#### THE FEDERAL EXCISE TAX ON NEW PASSENGER AUTOMOBILES SUMMARY

This statement reviews the economic consequences arising from the Federal 10-percent excise tax on new passenger automobiles, which averages \$230 per car, and points out the necessity for the elimination or substantial reduction of this excessive wartime rate in the interest of national economic growth as well as tax equity.

The postwar growth of the U.S. economy is not attributable to any single factor, but rather has reflected the conjunction of a great many forces arising out of both the war and the depression preceding it. Under these circumstances, economic demand increased almost without regard to tax or other deterrents. The momentum of this process certainly stimulated U.S. economic growth through 1957. Since 1957, the growth rate has been slower; and it is no longer possible to endorse repressive taxation on

the one hand, while giving allegiance to economic growth on the other.

The present Federal excise tax structure is largely a product of war emergency needs to increase Federal revenues and to reduce consumption. Under such circumstances, the overall economic consequences of such excises have understandably been of secondary concern. In today's climate of slow economic growth, it is especially necessary to reconsider and reduce such deterrents as the 10-percent excise tax on new passenger automobiles.

In recent years, the selective and discriminatory aspects of the new passenger automobile excise tax have become even more pronounced as Congress has granted rate reductions in the excise tax on other consumer goods and services. It will be recalled that, in recent years, tax reductions have been made by Congress on numerous items—electric, gas, and oil appliances, refrigerators, jewelry, cosmetics, and only this year on passenger rail, bus, and airline fares. A new passenger automobile is the principal consumer durable which is still subject to tax at wartime rates. In the case of a new passenger car, this averages about \$230, an amount in excess of the annual individual income tax paid by several million taxpayers. Over 11 years have now passed since the current 10 percent rate was first imposed; and over 21 years have elapsed since the rate was increased from 3½ to 7 percent to meet the needs of World War II.

Viewed in terms of its broad economic impact, the 10 percent excise tax on new passenger cars is comparable in its effect to a tariff—designed to limit rather than to stimulate consumption. In fact, it is clear that the increases to 7 percent and then to 10 percent were intended to discourage consumption of cars and raw materials as well as to increase Federal revenues. The long-term direct result in an economy no longer primarily oriented toward war is less vigorous growth—less production, less employment, and less investment than would otherwise be forthcoming. The indirect results of such repressive taxation touch all the hundreds of thousands of businesses, small and large, that depend upon the growing production and use of passenger automobiles.

The automotive industry's vital role in the economy is clear—it provides about 6 million jobs in the production, distribution and service of its product and constitutes nearly 10 percent of the Nation's gross national product. In 1960, for example, the automotive industry consumed 21 percent of all steel, 62 percent of all rubber, 11 percent of all aluminum, 47 percent of all lead, and 35 percent of all the zinc used in the United States. In addition, it provides a substantial share of the market for a host of other materials and products—textiles, copper, electrical goods.

In the post World War II period, the automotive industry's \$14 billion investment in new plant and equipment plus added billions for new tools and techniques has provided an important stimulus and been an innovating force felt throughout the whole economy. New jobs and new products have resulted from these automotive investments.

Moreover, the indirect effects of the industry have been even more beneficial to the economy. The growth of the passenger car industry has been the stimulus which has reshaped the American landscape—new highways, new urban developments, new shopping centers and new housing have all been affected and stimulated by the growth of automobile use. Thus, the industry generates effects on consumption and investment that are far more widespread than almost any other industry's contribution since the railroads opened up the country in the 19th century.



The many requests by the automobile industry in the past for relief from the burden of a high and discriminatory excise tax rate have received the careful and sympathetic consideration of the congressional tax committees and the Treasury. Nevertheless, immediate revenue needs have been given priority in considering the tax on automobiles on past occasions. Now, in conjunction with a general review of the Federal tax structure's effects on economic growth, the longrun effects of the automobile tax also require further consideration. To the extent that this tax acts as a brake on the Nation's economic growth, it may actually impede the related growth in Federal tax revenues from all sources.

If the automobile excise tax were reduced from 10 percent to, say, 3 percent, it is estimated that \$1 billion of added purchasing power would be immediately released. Normally, an increase in consumer income of two times the amount of the tax cut, in this case about \$2 billion, would be added annually to the income stream. In turn, this \$2 billion increase would generate an estimated \$600 million additional Federal tax revenues. This increase would offset 60 percent of the immediate revenue reduction attributable to a 7-percentage-point cut in the automobile excise tax rate.

There is a growing realization in and out of Government that the current tax structure constitutes a drag on economic growth. This view also holds that, in the long run, the revenue requirements of the Federal Government can best be met by a vigorously expanding economy. Ultimately, elimination of the present 10-percent Federal excise tax on passenger cars, and presently, a substantial reduction in the tax from 10 percent to not more than 3 percent would remove a discriminatory levy on the sale of new automobiles. This levy has been permitted, for short-term considerations, to persist too long after the emergencies which prompted its imposition.

#### BACKGROUND

##### *History of the automobile excise tax*

The crises of war in this century have imposed two major economic requirements on the national economy. The first was the need for a prompt increase in Federal revenues to finance war costs. The second need was to discourage private demand in order to release economic resources required for the war effort. Excise taxes, of which the automobile excise is an outstanding example, have served both purposes efficiently in wartime. However, under wartime circumstances, measures to stimulate the rate of economic growth were not and did not need to be vital considerations. The economy operated at forced draft with full or overfull utilization of labor and capital facilities to meet military demands.

The first automobile excise tax was imposed during World War I at a rate of 3 percent of the manufacturer's selling price. A subsequent increase to 5 percent was enacted early in 1919 to help defray the war costs and those of demobilization. However, Congress recognized the war-related nature of the tax, and within a few years first reduced and then repealed the emergency automobile excises created by the war emergency. Thus, in 1926, the 5 percent tax on passenger cars was reduced to 3 percent, and in 1928, the tax was repealed. In the face of these tax reductions, overall Government revenues continued to increase steadily during the 1920's. In fact, the tax reductions which left more dollars in the hands of consumers may well have played an important role in the vigor displayed by the economy during this period.

To meet a budgetary crisis arising out of the depression, and in lieu of a general man-

ufacturer's sales tax, a number of emergency excise taxes were imposed in the economically depressed year of 1932. One such tax was the 3-percent excise tax imposed on new passenger automobiles. These selective excises were continued during the depression years. No definite answer can be given as to the extent that the imposition of these taxes during the depression may have retarded recovery. However, it is noteworthy that, even under the growing pressures of a rearming economy, following the outbreak of actual war in Europe in 1939, Congress saw fit to impose an automobile excise tax of only 3½ percent in 1940. This was followed by an increase to 7 percent in the fall of 1941. This rate, however, was largely ineffective during the war, owing to production limitations. And, in the immediate postwar years, the pressures of pent-up demand effectively obscured the economic effects of the tax.

With the outbreak of the Korean war, it will be recalled, the automobile excise rate was increased to a "temporary" 10 percent. But this "temporary" Korean war rate has been continued for over 11 years despite the fact that wartime inflationary pressures, which obscure the economic effects of discriminatory excise taxes, have long since vanished.

The historical record of the legislative changes in the Federal excise tax on new passenger cars since 1917 is shown in the table below:

##### *Federal excise tax rates on new passenger automobiles 1917-62*

[Excise tax rate on manufacturer's selling price]	
Effective date:	Percent
Oct. 4, 1917-----	3
Feb. 25, 1919-----	5
Mar. 28, 1926-----	3
May 29, 1928-----	-----
June 21, 1932-----	3
July 1, 1940-----	3½
Oct. 1, 1941-----	7
Nov. 1, 1951, to date-----	10

The high wartime automobile excise tax rate should now be modified to a level compatible with our longrun peacetime economic goals of growth and full employment. With the current emphasis on restructuring the Federal tax system to accomplish these objectives, Congress now has such an opportunity.

##### *Congressional action on other emergency excise taxes*

While the 10 percent automobile excise tax has remained unchanged since the Korean war, Congress has subsequently reduced or repealed numerous other so-called emergency taxes on both goods and services. In 1954, Congress reduced the Federal excise taxes on several major groups of consumer goods. These included refrigerators, electric, gas and oil appliances, as well as jewelry, cameras, and sporting goods.

In 1954, Congress also lowered the excise taxes on general admissions and local telephone service. Subsequently, in 1958, the excise taxes on the transportation of freight and the movement of oil by pipeline were repealed. Only this year, the 10 percent tax on rail and bus fares was repealed, while the 10 percent tax on air fares was reduced to 5 percent.

These periodic excise tax reductions on other goods and services have accentuated the selective and discriminatory nature of the 10 percent tax on new passenger cars. A new automobile is the principal consumer durable goods still subject to excise tax at wartime rates. This tax averages about \$230 per car, an amount in excess of the annual individual income tax paid by several millions of taxpayers.

##### *Vital economic use of passenger automobile*

The passenger automobile, today, plays a vital role in the Nation's economic life. For a host of business and professional men, such as doctors, salesmen, lawyers, accountants, and insurance representatives, a car is a vital business tool contributing importantly to their efficiency. Recent studies prepared by the Bureau of Public Roads of the U.S. Department of Commerce disclosed the fact that car use by the general public is predominantly for necessity—e.g., for business, school and shopping purposes, with less than 20 percent of all automobile trips by urban residents being made for social or recreational purposes. Americans find their cars essential to modern living and business.

Congress, in enacting the 10-percent rate on passenger cars, acknowledged the burden imposed by this high rate on car purchases. Thus, both the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee in their reports on the Revenue Act of 1951, stated:

"However, your committee recognizes that cars represent a necessity to a large segment of the population under present conditions and, therefore, deemed it inappropriate to increase the rate above 10 percent on the manufacturer's price, the rate applying in the case of most manufacturers' excises. Moreover, the purchase of a car represents a larger outlay on the part of the consumer than is true in the case of most other durable consumption items, with the result that the amount of the tax payment in these cases is larger than in the purchase of other durable goods and, therefore, likely to be considered more burdensome."

The burden of the tax on passenger cars has even wider implications, however, than those suggested above. In today's circumstances, the burden imposed by a repressive automobile tax is felt by the whole economy whose growth is constricted by a consumption tax that retards both production and investment. Our concern, therefore, is not only with the impact of the tax on the car buyer and the automobile industry, but also with its significance in terms of national economic growth.

##### *The economic importance of the automobile industry*

In measuring the economic effects of the 10-percent excise tax on new passenger cars, the relative magnitude of the automobile industry in the economy is highly significant. Few industries can match the automobile industry for its overall impact on the national economy. For example, in 1960, automotive related sales, including the purchase of passenger cars and the cost of their operation, totaled \$47 billion and represented 9.4 percent of the gross national product.

In terms of manpower, the employment opportunities provided by the automotive industry are well known. The number and variety of jobs generated directly and indirectly by the industry would be legion. While the manufacture of automobiles, alone, has provided work directly for nearly 700,000 people, the total employment opportunities generated by those who supply the industry and service and distribute its product is many times that number—with the total for the industry possibly in excess of 6 million employees.

It should also be recognized that almost one business out of every six in the United States is dependent upon the manufacture, distribution, service and use of motor vehicles. On the basis of an analysis of data developed in the 1958 Census of Manufacturers and Census of Business, the AMA has estimated that close to 800,000 individual businesses in the United States depend on the motor vehicle and, primarily, on the

passenger car. This includes close to 300,000 passenger car dealers and gasoline service stations, and over 100,000 independent automobile repair shops.

It should also be noted that the automotive consumption of many materials sustains the growth and development of numerous other industries vital to our industrial base and economic growth. For example, in 1960, 21 percent of all steel, 62 percent of all rubber, 35 percent of all zinc, 11 percent of all aluminum, and 47 percent of all the lead used in the United States was for automotive purposes.

In the light of the foregoing data, it is apparent that the adverse effects of an excessive tax on new passenger cars will be widespread throughout the whole economy. The impact of the new car excise extends from basic industries such as steel and aluminum to hundreds of thousands of small businesses in manufacturing, distribution, and servicing of automobiles.

#### AUTOMOBILES AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

Economic growth in the United States has often been described as the resultant of one or more major innovating forces which combine to open up a wide range of new investment opportunities. The development of the railroads in the last half of the 19th century and early 20th century is often cited as a major factor in the dynamic growth of the economy during that period. Following World War I, the rising automobile industry replaced the railroad system as a major innovating force.

However, the ability of the automobile industry to continue as a dynamic factor in national long-term economic growth will be facilitated by relief from discriminatory taxation which impairs its freedom to compete on equal terms with other industries in the U.S. economy. It is with the long-term economic consequences of the repressive 10 percent new automobile excise tax to the Nation, not just one industry, that Congress must primarily be concerned. It is clear that the economic vitality of the automobile industry will be intimately involved in the Nation's growth rate for the future, as it is currently and has been in the past. Freed of excessive tax burdens, the industry can be expected to continue to play its role in making the investment needed to meet our economic goals.

#### *Investment in plant and equipment by the automotive industry*

The postwar growth of the U.S. economy is not attributable to any single factor, but rather has reflected the conjunction of a great many forces arising out of both the war and the depression preceding it. Under these circumstances, economic demand increased almost without regard to tax or other deterrents. The momentum of this process certainly stimulated U.S. economic growth through 1957. Since 1957, the growth rate has been slower; and it is no longer possible to endorse repressive taxation on the one hand, while giving allegiance to economic growth on the other. The excise tax on new passenger cars is one such repressive tax. Its only effect can be to retard growth, and the harmful effects of the tax can extend far beyond the limits of the automobile industry into almost every phase of contemporary life.

From the automobile industry's very beginning, the force of innovation has been one of its outstanding characteristics. Moreover, it has acted as a spur to the growth of other industries and a strengthening force to the Nation's economy. The very nature of competition in the automobile industry (including competition with foreign manufacturers) has required that each manufacturer strive constantly to turn out better products than its competitors at the lowest possible cost. This has led to continual improvement, from one model year to another.

Such improvement requires substantial investment in both plant and equipment.

Excise taxes which press on long-term demand will certainly constitute a more substantial deterrent to new economic growth in the future than they have in the early postwar years. They can, to a significant degree, offset much of the effort of American industry to achieve the growth in volume demand which is basic to rising investment. As Dr. Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, has recently said:

"By strengthening sales and pushing output closer to capacity, tax reduction spurs investment in inventories and in new equipment and new plants. This impact on investment in productive capacity is called the 'accelerator effect.' The increased production of capital goods expands gross national product, stimulates further consumption and increases profits. It reduces the deterrent effect of excess capacity, which has tended to discourage investment in productive facilities during the past 5 years or so."

During the period from 1946-62, the automotive industry has been a leader in plant and equipment expenditures for both the modernization and expansion of its production facilities. The industry invested \$14 billion in manufacturing facilities, excluding the heavy cost of tools for new model cars. This represented nearly one-sixth of all the plant and equipment expenditures by durable goods producers during the 1946-62 period. It would not be unreasonable to claim that this volume of plant and equipment expenditures has been a significant factor in the postwar growth and prosperity of the national economy. It has enabled the industry, in spite of rising labor costs, to meet consumer demand efficiently and to contribute importantly to price stability. Significantly, for example, since 1958 the list prices of comparable automobiles have remained virtually unchanged.

An especially important part of new investment is that which contributes to technological improvement under the stress of increasingly competitive markets. The technological change fostered by the automotive industry's investment has been a major innovating force in our economy. New and better products as well as improved production methods have resulted therefrom. This has opened up a wide spectrum of opportunities for men with imagination and initiative. Such change thus promotes new jobs and, in turn, stimulates further new capital investment. The President, in his 1962 economic message, pointed out this close relationship between technological innovation and investment when he stated:

"Investment in new equipment serves as a vehicle for technological improvements and is perhaps the most important way in which laboratory discoveries become incorporated in the productive process."

The investment by the automotive industry of \$14 billion in new plant and equipment during the post-World War II period has been such a vehicle. It has permitted the industry to provide better products and, as noted, has enabled it in recent years to hold the price line.

#### *The interstate highway program*

The investment in other areas of the economy resulting from rising car usage is clearly seen in connection with the Interstate Highway System now in process of construction. This program is wholly financed by taxes levied on the direct beneficiaries of the highway program and will involve an average national expenditure of some \$4 billion annually over a 10-year period. In addition to its direct investment effects, the highway program will contribute to the increased efficiency of the movement of goods and people,

with greater safety than ever before. The program also adds importantly to our national defense capabilities. Further, it opens up new and more productive uses of land for industrial development with attendant rises in land values and commercial activity which have improved the tax resources of State and local governments.

#### *Living changes attributable to increased car use*

The tremendous shifts of industry and population occurring in the United States since World War II provide another example of investment opportunities which have been induced by the growth of automobile use. The automobile has changed the face of the American landscape and the whole mode of living for millions of our citizens. Out of this has come new demand creating forces that have expanded whole industries beyond anything imagined before World War II.

The rapid growth of metropolitan areas after World War II unquestionably was fostered by the automobile and the expanded road systems around the urban centers. The remarkable increase in private residential housing after World War II has been unequalled in the history of this or any other country. The construction of nearly 1,300 new shopping centers in the United States during the period 1947-60 can also be attributed in large part to the increased mobility of the American consumer provided by the automobile.

The examples above are but a few dramatic illustrations of how a major force like the passenger automobile can promote investment which contributes to national economic growth and better living standards for millions. As shown, the demand for automobiles carries with it a derived demand for a host of other products and services requiring new investment that helps to build and develop our entire national economy.

#### *Excise tax reduction—Effect on aggregate consumer demand*

As observed earlier, the increase in the automobile excise tax reflected, in part, a desire to reduce new car demand under the pressures of a war emergency. In contrast, under today's very different economic circumstances, it seems clear that a reduction in the 10-percent excise tax on new passenger cars would favorably influence overall economic demand in the long run, even if this effect might not be immediately evident. The importance of this type of economic stimulation through tax reduction has already been recognized by both the Canadian and British Governments, which have been faced with similar problems of accelerating economic growth.

Under the intense competitive pressures existing in the automobile markets today, reduction in the excise tax on new passenger cars would be reflected in lower costs to the consumer. The tax today, on the average, is \$230. Reduction of this tax from 10 percent to, say, 3 percent would reduce the tax by about \$160 per car.

While the industry believes it is logical and appropriate to assume that a reduction in the new passenger car excise tax will stimulate aggregate consumer demand in the long run, it is, of course, difficult to specify the precise demand increase to be expected. Nevertheless, the release of an amount in excess of \$1 billion is certain to influence favorably aggregate consumer demand—that is, the demand for all types of goods and services. Over a period of a year, it is generally considered reasonable to expect aggregate demand to increase by at least two times the amount of any tax reduction.

While the benefit of an automobile excise tax reduction to purchasers of new cars is readily apparent, a benefit will also be afforded to purchasers of used cars even



though such vehicles are not subject to any Federal excise tax. In 1960, over 40 percent of all used and new car sales were in overlapping or competitive price groups. As a result, any lower price on new cars attributable to a reduction in the excise tax would induce a used car price decline, in order for them to remain competitive with new cars. Thus, the beneficial effects of a reduction in the new car excise tax would (1) result in a cost saving on the price of a used car, (2) bring buyers into the used car market who could not afford cars offered at prices reflecting the current high excise and (3) release these substantial savings on cars for use elsewhere in the economy.

Thus, the stone of tax reduction cast into the economic pool creates an ever-widening circle of effects throughout the economy—all favorable. Some broad estimates of these effects are discussed below.

#### *Stimulating effect of an automobile excise tax reduction*

There is widespread agreement that tax reduction has a stimulating effect on spending and income and produces an increase in gross national product generally equal to two or more times the amount of the original tax cut. To the extent that this occurs, of course, additional tax revenues are generated by the increased economic activity. As a result, the ultimate revenue effect for the Government can be substantially different from the immediate effect associated with the initial tax reduction.

Thus, if the automobile excise tax were reduced from 10 percent to, say, 3 percent, it is estimated that \$1 billion of added purchasing power would be immediately released. If we assume that the increase in consumer income will be about two times the amount of the tax cut (i.e., the tax reduction will turn over twice within the year), then \$2 billion would be added annually to the income stream (gross national product) as a result of the tax cut—providing this excise tax reduction is not offset by corresponding increases in other taxes. In turn, this \$2 billion increase in gross national product would generate an estimated \$600 million additional Federal tax revenues. This increase would offset 60 percent of the immediate revenue reduction attributable to a 7 percentage point cut in the automobile excise tax rate of 10 percent.

A favorable effect on aggregate investment as well as consumption can also arise out of reduction of the car excise tax. Where sales press upon industrial capacity, an incentive would be given to spending for new plant capacity. This, in turn, would further expand both national income and consumption and thereby generate added Federal revenues. As a result, a tax cut could, in the long run, increase overall tax revenues. The experience of the 1920's tends to bear this out. In Great Britain, the Government has just reduced the tax on domestically purchased automobiles in an effort to stimulate the economy. Only a year or so ago, Canada repealed its special excise tax on cars to aid its total economy.

The United States is now in a position to make the long overdue reduction in the new passenger car excise which other countries have already undertaken. As noted above, the entire economy would benefit from such a stimulus to economic growth. Tax reduction can be the needed impetus required to achieve the accelerated growth rate required for full employment of the Nation's manpower and physical resources.

We can no longer afford the retention of taxes at wartime rate levels designed to repress consumption and investment. In today's economy, discriminatory and excessive tax rates put a burden upon the consumer and business which is reflected in lagging consumption and investment with resulting high unemployment and underutilization of plant and equipment.

The Automobile Manufacturers Association therefore respectfully submits that Congress should give a high priority to reduction or elimination of the 10-percent excise tax on new passenger cars, as a meaningful and necessary contribution to the progress and growth of the American economy.

#### GENERAL NOTE

As presented in the foregoing statement, the Automobile Manufacturers Association holds strongly to the conviction that selective excise taxes, at discriminatory rates, are harmful to the economy as well as to the industries whose products are so taxed. However, the association recognizes that, under certain circumstances, revenue needs as well as the requirements of a balanced tax structure may require some form of excise taxation. Therefore, the association wishes to make it clear that it will not oppose any nondiscriminatory taxes levied on consumer goods and services at low rates if Congress should feel that such taxation were required.

The AMA recognizes that the best means to the attainment of needed tax reduction is control of Federal expenditures to prevent their growth at a rate equal to or exceeding that of national income. Under such circumstances, economic growth, over the long term, can be expected to yield adequate revenues to meet all reasonable requirements of the Federal Government at tax rates well below the excessive levels currently imposed.

#### APPENDIX

TABLE 1.—Percent remaining of Korean war rates in Federal excise taxes on selected manufactured goods

Manufactured goods	Unit of tax	Percent remaining of Korean war rate	Year Korean rate reduced
Passenger automobiles	Manufacturer's sales price	100	-----
Refrigerators	do	50	1954
Electric, gas, and oil appliances	do	50	1954
Cigarette, cigar, and pipe lighters	do	60%	1954
Electric light bulbs	do	50	1954
Cameras	do	50	1954
Sporting goods	do	60%	1954
Jewelry	do	50	1954

Source: Derived from U.S. Treasury Department data.

TABLE 2.—Distribution of passenger-car trips by major purpose of travel

Purpose of travel	Percentage distribution of—	
	Trips	Vehicle-miles
Earning a living:		
To and from work	33.6	26.0
Related business	13.9	17.7
Total	47.5	43.7
Family business:		
Medical and dental	1.4	1.9
Shopping	15.0	6.9
Other	10.7	8.7
Total	27.1	17.5
Educational, civic, and religious	6.1	3.2
Social and recreational:		
Vacations	2	4.8
Pleasure rides	7.2	12.8
Other	11.9	18.0
Total	19.3	35.6
All purposes	100.0	100.0

Source: Highway Transportation, Office of Research, Bureau of Public Roads, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1960.

TABLE 3.—Purchases of passenger cars and related automobile expenditures by consumers and business, 1960

[Billions of dollars]

Expenditures by consumers and business:	
Purchases of passenger cars	18
Auto-related items:	
Gas and oil	14
Repairs and service	6
Tires, parts and accessories	4
Financing charges	3
Insurance and miscellaneous	2
Subtotal	29
Total	47

Source: Derived from U.S. Department of Commerce data.

TABLE 4.—Automotive consumption of selected raw materials—1960

	U.S. total consumption	Automotive consumption	Percent automotive
Steel, all forms (tons)	71,149,218	14,610,424	20.5
Rubber (long tons)	1,834,808	1,144,620	62.3
Zinc (tons)	861,125	299,775	34.8
Aluminum (tons)	2,329,000	257,000	11.0
Lead (tons)	1,021,200	479,300	46.9

Source: Based on data from various trade associations published in *Automobile Facts and Figures*, 1962, Automobile Manufacturers Association.

### PRESIDENT'S YOUTH EMPLOYMENT ACT MAKES POSSIBLE ESTABLISHMENT OF HOMETOWN YOUTH CORPS IN CITY OF PHILADELPHIA

**THE SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BYRNE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, during the decade of the 1960's, 26 million young people will enter the labor market—an average of about 2½ million each year. The lack of experience of these young people who have already entered into the competition for jobs has been determined during the early years of this decade. In January 1963, over 700,000 young people aged 16 through 21 years of age were dropouts of school and out of work.

Unemployment rates in the 16 through 21 age group are about three times as high as unemployment in the adult population. Among those unfortunate youngsters who dropped out of school before completing high school the problem of unemployment reaches its most intense form with 28 out of every 100 school dropouts unemployed, according to Department of Labor studies.

To meet the challenge of putting our young people to work during the 1960's will require the creation of 25,000 new jobs each week for the next 10 years. In commenting on this urgent problem, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz made the following statement to the House Labor Committee:

We recognize that the basic answer to this problem must be in the achievement of that growth rate in the economy which will mean more jobs through private employment. Better education, training, and counseling are also necessary. But there is also increasing evidence that special measures are required to provide some of our unemployed youngsters with special opportunities for

learning work disciplines and skills, with the added dividend of motivation to return to school for further education and training.

I believe H.R. 1890, the President's Youth Employment Act, will serve admirably the need to provide the special training opportunities that presently out-of-work young people must receive to fit them for beginning jobs.

Title I of the act creates a Youth Conservation Corps modeled after the highly successful Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's. Under this provision, 15,000 young men aged 16 through 21 years would be given the chance to work in camps in national forests and parks under the supervision of skilled workmen, and with classroom schoolwork in the evenings to fill in the gaps in their education. Enrollments would be for a period of 6 months, with the opportunity to reenlist for additional 6-month periods up to a total of 2 years. Work in the camps would be done on projects to make our national lands more attractive for recreational use.

The boys will work with tools such as light construction equipment, power tools, compressor drills, and the like which are used extensively in civilian work. Following completion of enlistment, the Youth Conservation Corps trained youth will return to the local office of the State employment service through which he was originally selected. Here his skills, work habits, and classroom training will be evaluated and, on the basis of this newly acquired experience, he will be referred to potential employers for job interviews. The purpose of the YCC is to follow a young man from original selection, through training in the Corps, through the job interview stage, and into the job.

Title II of the bill, which has come to be referred to as the "Home Town Youth Corps" has great potential usefulness for the city of Philadelphia. Briefly, the Home Town Youth Corps will provide for programs of useful employment of a public service nature to be sponsored by city or county governments, with 50 percent of the cost to be borne by the Federal Government. In testifying on this part of the Youth Employment Act before a Senate subcommittee, Randolph E. Wise, Philadelphia welfare commissioner, said the program was urgently needed by urban centers.

In Philadelphia, nearly 8,000 youths 16 years of age and older dropped out of school prior to graduation from high school in 1961 alone, according to Mr. Wise. And he added that the size and scope of the problem make it obvious that the Federal Government must share responsibility for its prevention and control.

Work in the Hometown Youth Corps will be performed by both young men and young women aged 16 through 21. The work will include service in hospitals where nurse aids are very much in demand; in schools where members of the Hometown Youth Corps can perform clerical work, and thus free teachers for classroom work; in libraries, in welfare agencies; in children's homes and in other branches of Government where they will be learning job skills

without displacing regular workers. When a young person has completed work in a Hometown Youth Corps project he or she will be referred to the local employment service office for placement.

All of us must make the transition from the schoolday world of youth to the adult working world. The transition is not an easy one to make. It is even more difficult these days because of the disappearance of many of the unskilled jobs once performed by youngsters just out of school. Our responsibility to young people does not end when they leave school. In a very real sense it begins at once when they cannot find an established place of employment in the complicated world in which we live and continues until they are placed in a job. The President's Youth Employment Act offers a needed lift to our young people at the most critical period in their lives.

#### CAN PUBLIC FUNDS BE CONSTITUTIONALLY GRANTED TO PRIVATE SCHOOLS?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the issues joined for Congress in proposals for Federal aid to education are not simple ones, nor are they new ones. There are enormously important questions, including those of need, of scope, of formulation, of policy, and of national purpose. The Congress has considered these matters in various ways for years and the complexities presented are evidenced by the important fact that they are still with us for consideration in this session.

Among the important issues that have confronted us in the past and are before the Congress again relate directly to private schools at the college level and at the elementary and secondary levels. These schools are enmeshed in the same considerations already mentioned but present special additional issues for deliberation and resolution, partly because they are private schools, but importantly, because of mistaken and misleading attitudes toward them. The term "private school" itself presents its complexities. It is legally recognized as an integral part of the States' public school programs for the purpose of compulsory attendance laws. There is no quarrel over recognition of the immense contribution made by these schools to public purposes and none respecting the excellence of the education given to citizen students. There is no question remaining respecting their juridical status. But there persists widespread misconception of these schools and lingering but diminishing controversy over the permissibility of provision of public funds for education in these private schools.

Opponents to the participation of private schools, especially the church related, private school, premise opposition

on a disturbing absolutism in asserting a constitutional prohibition to their entitled participation in public assistance in any form. But support of that position mainly rests on dicta in decisions and extremely dubious interpretation of relevant constitutional precedent.

Fortunately, the pendency of the proposals for Federal assistance to education has stimulated new and substantive research into these important constitutional questions. Legal scholars, in increasing numbers across the country, are devoting renewed attention to the constitutional issues and with penetrating new vision. It is important to Members of Congress to be aware of this developing and expanding concentration and especially the clarification and illumination these research efforts impart to the problem before us.

At a symposium on church-state problems, sponsored by the University of Chicago Law School, an important address was given by Rev. Robert F. Drinan, S.J., dean, Boston College Law School, entitled "Can Public Funds Be Constitutionally Granted to Private Schools?" This is only an example, but an important one in the current scholarly evaluation of constitutional principles. To assist my colleagues in Congress in their heavy responsibilities to review again these issues, Dean Drinan's address follows:

#### CAN PUBLIC FUNDS BE CONSTITUTIONALLY GRANTED TO PRIVATE SCHOOLS? (By Rev. Robert F. Drinan, S.J.)

It would be an easy answer to the question under discussion in this paper if we could simply state that no public funds should ever be expended for private purposes. With regard to schools, however, the fact is that no nonpublic school can be private in every sense of that term. American law recognized in the Pierce decision the right of the private school to exist and has thereby given to it a juridical status. This status, however ambiguous, has rendered the private school a quasi-public or, if you will, a parapublic institution.

The fundamental issue therefore in the controversy over public funds for private schools arises out of the fact that private schools are public schools for the purpose of compulsory attendance laws but have not been designated as public schools capable of being the beneficiaries of public funds. The anomalous juridical status of the private school in America has no parallel or precedent in any other phase of our law. Those who seek to retain Pierce and yet reverse Everson do not appreciate the implications of the juridical position conferred on the private school by Pierce. Those who seek to retain Pierce and who would accept Everson as containing the ultimate concessions which can be made to the private school likewise do not appreciate the logical implications of the holding in Pierce.

#### THE PUBLIC DIMENSIONS OF PRIVATE SCHOOLS

Let us start then with Pierce and see if from this decision there can be developed a line of reasoning by which the private school can claim to be an institution charged with a public responsibility and hence eligible for some public funds.

As is well known, Pierce was decided a few days before the guarantees of the 1st amendment were for the first time transferred to the States via the 14th amendment. Consequently, Pierce decided nothing about first amendment freedoms in relation to the existence of the private school. But the spirit of the Pierce decision clearly affirmed that



no institutionalized dissent from educational orthodoxy could be constitutionally suppressed. The brief opinion in *Pierce*, however, left almost totally unsolved the extent to which a private school, legally recognized as a permissible substitute for the public school, could on this basis claim a right to be supported by public funds.

A plausible argument can be made for the proposition that the *Pierce* decision elevated the private school to the status of a publicly recognized institution which cannot logically and fairly be granted State accreditation and denied State subsidization. Even if, however, everyone agreed with this conclusion the real issue confronting the Nation today and the thorny problem to be discussed in this paper would not be resolved. That issue is, of course, not the private but the church-related school and, more particularly, the Catholic school.

In order, therefore, to give reality to the discussion it is proposed to talk here not in a conceptualistic way about public money and private schools but in a realistic way about Federal aid and Catholic educational institutions. At the same time it must be recognized that no satisfactory resolution of the controversy over the very small subsidy to church-related schools which is in issue in connection with Federal aid can be reached without attaining some agreement on the function and juridical nature of the private school in America.

What then is the claim being made by Catholic parents and Catholic officials? The claim is a very small one; the Catholic contention is that, if Federal aid is to be enacted, some recognition should be given to Catholic schools. This Catholic request is grounded on several factors among which are the following:

1. About 92 percent of all children attending private schools in America today are enrolled in Catholic elementary and secondary schools.

2. Some 6 million students—or every eighth child in America—attend a Catholic school. Any program designed to elevate the Nation's standards of educational excellence which ignores the 12 percent of the Nation's schoolchildren enrolled in non-public schools is neglecting in a serious manner a significant element in the population.

3. The first program of massive Federal aid to education must in the nature of things be designed either to help public schools alone or to elevate the educational excellence of all schools. Consequently, an important public policy decision must be made before Federal aid can become a reality.

Even this telescoped version of the Catholic case for a share in the distribution of Federal aid to education will indicate that the controversy over this issue involves profound questions of public policy. These questions can be resolved in a speculative way by peering into the interstices of the half dozen church-state opinions which the Supreme Court has written from *Everson* to *Engel*. But even the most resourceful and convinced advocate or opponent of Federal aid for Catholic schools must confess that the most careful reading of all Supreme Court decisions and dicta leads only to the feeling that the real questions have not yet been asked, much less resolved, in Supreme Court jurisprudence.

Some few "absolutes," however, with regard to religion and education have emerged from the *Everson* to *Engel* line of cases. The following principles seem to have a secure place in church-state law:

- I. The benefits of public welfare legislation may not be granted or denied to citizens because of their religious faith or their lack of it.

- II. If the State, in the pursuit of a legitimate public purpose, selects means to achieve this purpose which have an incidental effect of assisting religion, such means are not

thereby unconstitutional—especially if no alternate means are as easily available.

- III. No sectarian teaching or religious practice may be constitutionally permitted on the premises of a tax-supported school—even if student and teacher participation is on a truly voluntary basis.

Analyzing in turn each of these three broad principles, what can one conclude about the constitutionality of a grant of public money to a Catholic school?

#### I. PUBLIC WELFARE LEGISLATION

If there was one thing that Mr. Justice Black sought to make clear in *Everson* it was the finding that the challenged statute authorizing reimbursement to Catholic parents for school bus transportation for their children was public welfare legislation. Mr. Justice Black assumed or asserted several conclusions which formed the following line of reasoning:

1. Public welfare legislation is ordinarily identifiable as a particular type of law and should not be nullified by the courts except for the gravest reasons.

2. Such public welfare legislation is not unconstitutional even if it facilitates attendance at church-related schools.

3. Such legislation does not offend against the wall of separation between church and state provided that (1) any aid given to religion is incidental to the main purpose of the law and (2) a denial of such aid would be discrimination against persons or groups because of their faith or lack of it.

It may be that someone would challenge the foregoing summary of *Everson* as inadequate and even misleading. Such a person could indeed cite respectable authority for his position because the fact is that several State courts have been confused about the meaning and thrust of *Everson*. The opinion of Mr. Justice Black is more encouraging to the advocate of Federal aid for Catholic schools than are the several interpretations placed on the opinion by the four dissenting Justices in *Everson*. Equally discouraging are the interpretations given to *Everson* by the Supreme Courts of the States of Washington, New Mexico, Oregon, Wisconsin, and Alaska. All these tribunals have given lip service to *Everson* but have declared laws granting bus transportation or other benefits to Catholic schoolchildren to be unconstitutional even though these laws were concededly written and enacted as public welfare legislation. In other words, State courts have not accepted the idea that public welfare legislation is constitutionally permissible if it only grants to children in Catholic schools those benefits which are also granted to pupils in public schools. The basic rationale of *Everson* has either been misunderstood, misinterpreted or rejected. Only the Supreme Courts of Connecticut and Maine have accepted and followed *Everson* as meaning that bus transportation statutes can be framed as public welfare legislation in such a manner as to be constitutionally unassailable.

The confusion over the meaning of *Everson* has not been lessened by the fact that the U.S. Supreme Court has since 1951 refused to review decisions based on *Everson* from the States of Washington, Connecticut, Oregon, and Alaska. One can argue, therefore, either that *Everson* is properly interpreted by the highest court of Connecticut which sustained the constitutionality of a law authorizing bus transportation to private schools or, on the other hand, that *Everson* has almost no relevance or meaning at the State level—as the highest courts of Washington, Wisconsin, and Alaska have declared.

It will be seen, therefore, that the history of *Everson* does not encourage one to employ it as a firm foundation for a case for Federal aid to Catholic schools. At the same time the literal wording of Mr. Justice Black's opinion in *Everson* supplies a

solid basis for a line of argument that would support the case which Catholics and others are making on behalf of the constitutionality of Federal aid for private schools. The fact is that *Everson* reaffirmed *Cochran* and the child-benefit theory and that *Everson* is still good law—despite *McCormick*, *Torcaso*, and *Engel*. Mr. Leo Pfeffer highlights the consequences of Mr. Justice Black's opinion in this comment:

"When the *Everson* decision is coupled with the *Cochran* decision they lead logically to the conclusion that the State may, notwithstanding the first amendment, finance practically every aspect of parochial education, with the exception of such comparatively minor items as the proportionate salaries of teachers while they teach the catechism." ("Church, State and Freedom," p. 476.)

One could add a dimension to Mr. Pfeffer's reading of the *Cochran-Everson* rule by urging that in the ultimate analysis *Everson* follows from *Pierce*; public money, in other words, cannot logically be withheld from the private school if it is publicly accredited as an institution where children may fulfill their legal duty to attend school.

The many ambiguities in the *Pierce-Cochran-Everson* line of cases arise from the enigma which lies behind the institution to which has been assigned the nondescriptive and unenlightening name of the non-public or private school. Schools of this kind have an equivocal juridical status in America and until that status is clarified the entire controversy over the financing of such schools will be carried on in language and with concepts which do not really express the realities which they seek to describe. The terminology of "private" and "public" schools becomes even less useful when the private school in issue turns out to be a church-related school. The thorny issues involved in this area lead us to a discussion of the second "absolute" in the *Everson* to *Engel* line of cases—namely, the proposition that the State may constitutionally achieve a legitimate public purpose in such a way that an unintended incidental benefit comes to religion.

#### II. STATE PROGRAMS WHICH GIVE INCIDENTAL AID TO RELIGION

The various Supreme Court opinions in the Sunday law cases made it very clear that the requirement of separation between church and state does not mean that the state, in carrying out a legitimate secular purpose, must do so in a way which gives no aid to religion. It is significant to note that Mr. Justice Black, who wrote the rigorously separationist language in *Everson* and *McCormick*, sees no problem involving establishment or of free exercise of religion in Sunday laws which, whatever their present purpose may be said to be, clearly aid the Christian religion by fixing Sunday as a day of universal rest.

It is the secular purpose behind Sunday laws which, in the mind of the Supreme Court, renders them constitutional. As Mr. Justice Frankfurter put it in his concurring opinion in the Sunday law cases: "not every regulation, some of whose practical effects may facilitate the observance of a religion by its adherents, affronts the requirement of church-state separation."

Employing this reasoning the majority of the Supreme Court held that the incidental aid which Sunday laws give to the Christian religion does not make them unconstitutional. Nor are these laws contrary to the first amendment because of the "indirect burden on religious observance" which they impose on Sabbatarians. There is, however, a qualification on the power of the state to impose such a burden. As Chief Justice Warren put it:

"If the state regulates conduct by enacting a general law within its power, the pur-

pose and effect of which is to advance the state's secular goals, the statute is valid despite its indirect burden on religious observance unless a state may accomplish its purpose by means which do not impose such a burden."

Is it arguable from this principle that the state in carrying out its "secular goals" in the field of education has some obligation to do so, if possible, in a manner which does not impose even an "indirect burden on religious observance"? If Catholics could demonstrate that the denial of aid to their schools imposed a burden on their religious observance would such a law be subject to the qualification which Chief Justice Warren attached to Sunday laws?

Whatever one might answer to that question it is clear that the establishment clause has not been interpreted by the Supreme Court to mean that the secular aims of the state must be achieved in a manner deliberately designed to preclude any incidental aid to religion. In view of this position then, what policy can the state adopt with regard to the distribution of funds for the purpose of raising the Nation's standards of excellence in education?

The advocates of Federal aid for Catholic schools ground their plea on the principle that the state, in carrying out its secular goals in the field of education, can comply with the first amendment if it makes available funds for strictly secular purposes in all schools. Under such an arrangement no aid is intended for religion and whatever benefits students in church-related schools may receive are exclusively of a secular nature.

The two most fundamental objections to this line of reasoning are the following:

1. Even if public money were given to a Catholic school for strictly secular objectives these objectives would be carried forward in an atmosphere permeated by a Catholic orientation.

2. Even if this permeation can be prevented the grant of public money to a Catholic school makes available to this school funds which would otherwise be committed to the teaching of secular subjects.

Let us try to analyze and, if possible, bring some clarification to these two issues.

#### 1. Reflections on permeation

The permeation argument against aid to Catholic schools does not contend that the legitimate secular purpose which the state seeks to fulfill in giving aid for education in secular subjects is thwarted or frustrated in Catholic schools. The secular purpose is concededly carried out in Catholic schools but it is permeated—and somehow constitutionally contaminated—by a sectarian atmosphere. The argument against aid to church-related schools because of the permeation of sacred or sectarian values into the teaching of secular subjects must assume for its validity the viewpoint that the state is constitutionally required to seek out ways to carry out its secular objectives which will not give even incidental aid to religion. No such constitutional requirement can be found in the decisions from *Everson* to *Engel* and indeed the opinions in the Sunday law cases expressly deny the existence of any such constitutional requirement.

The opponents of Federal aid for Catholic schools who place great reliance on the permeation argument must logically say that the secular or silent attitude with regard to religion in the public schools is the only official orthodoxy which the state is allowed to promote in the pursuance of its public welfare objectives. This may be a philosophy of education subscribed to by a majority of the American people but it is not good constitutional law or, it is submitted, sound public policy.

Some recent writings on the permeation issue have focused attention on some graphic examples of the intermingling or rather the

intrusion of sectarian teaching into textbooks on secular subjects used in Catholic schools. Two comments on this matter seem appropriate:

A. No scientific study has ever been done on the question of the extent of the permeation of sectarian teaching in the instruction in secular subjects in Catholic schools. Concrete examples of such permeation in textbooks can be cited but an important distinction should be made between the factitious and indefensible insertion of sectarian symbols or teaching into secular subjects and the conclusions or judgments based on religious values which are properly found in texts in the area of the social sciences. The latter type of permeation is much more significant than the former and is, moreover, a justifiable exercise of academic freedom by social scientists writing from a particular point of view.

B. Although there undoubtedly exist some unjustifiable examples of permeation in secular textbooks used in Catholic schools little work has been done on the extent to which ultranationalistic or secularistic symbols and teachings have permeated the textbooks used in the public schools of America. Studies have shown, however, that the beliefs of minority groups, religious influences in American history and the religions of lands different from America have received very inadequate treatment in the textbooks which enjoy widespread use in the Nation's public schools. Many of these texts can be fairly and properly criticized as being permeated with an excessive emphasis on the secular with a resulting failure to give adequate treatment to the sacred, the sectarian or the spiritual elements in the life of man and of society.

Permeation is, therefore, a factor in every textbook since values are omnipresent. If the state, therefore, cannot constitutionally give public money for instruction in secular subjects if religious values are commingled in the instruction the state is equally disabled from financing instruction in secular subjects where the orientation of the instruction is, by silence or by implication, permeated with a secularistic outlook.

Those who argue against Federal aid for Catholic schools because there exists in these schools some permeation of secular subjects with sacred values must be prepared to accept the major premise of their argument—the assumption that the orientation of secular humanism is the only type of educational orthodoxy which the state can subsidize.

Even if permeation of secular instruction with sectarian teaching can be prevented, however, the additional argument is made that the granting of public money to nonpublic schools for instruction in secular subjects relieves this school from a financial obligation which it would otherwise have. Hence a church-related school would have more funds available to it and such funds could be used for sectarian purposes.

The logical thrust of this argument leads to the conclusion that any church-related school must be placed not in the category of a school but of a church. To deny public funds to nonpublic schools for secular instruction because such a grant would bring to the church-related school a freeing of otherwise committed funds is to state that the fully accredited school which is affiliated to a church thereby loses its right to any public funds even for exclusively secular purposes. Such a conclusion is specifically contrary to the *Everson* decision where Mr. Justice Black in effect conceded that the public money granted to parents for bus transportation of their children to a Catholic school would make available to the parents and to the school more money for other purposes.

The contention that the State should refuse public funds for the attainment of a

secular purpose unrelated to the religious function of a church-related school simply because such a grant would free the funds of this school for a religious purpose leads logically to the conclusion that no church-related institution may be entrusted with the implementation of any of the secular objectives of the state. Such a conclusion runs contrary to the basic traditions and the widespread contemporary practice of the state assisting church-related social welfare agencies in caring for the sick, the aged and those in need of social sciences.

It should be remembered that *Everson* sustained the constitutionality of a law which granted the benefits of public welfare legislation to individuals even though such benefits helped them to get to a church-related school. This result was reached in an opinion in which Mr. Justice Black stated:

"No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt, to teach or practice religion."

This famous sentence proscribes tax support only for "religious activities or institutions" in whatever form they may adopt "to teach or practice religion." It does not proscribe public funds for instruction in secular subjects even though such instruction may be conducted under the auspices of a religious institution. Far less does it forbid the granting of public funds to a church-related institution for the accomplishment of a secular purpose simply because such a grant might liberate other funds of this institution for a religious purpose.

Aid to religion as such is clearly forbidden by all the decisions from *Everson* to *Engel*. But state aid for the improvement of secular education need not be distributed only under circumstances where not even any incidental aid to religion may occur. The broadening of the concept of separation of church and state to this point must necessarily assume the validity of the theory that America is a completely secular state. Such a viewpoint makes it difficult if not impossible to reconcile the mandate of the establishment clause with the guarantee of the free exercise of religion clause.

It must be noted, however, that Supreme Court opinions from *Everson* to *Engel* are ambiguous at best with regard to the central question of whether America is a completely secular state. No decision has repudiated Mr. Justice Douglas' assertion in *Zorach* that "we are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being" but in the very same opinion Mr. Justice Douglas wrote that "Government may not blend secular and sectarian education." The Court has seemingly supported a theistic basis for America's legal institutions but has simultaneously insisted that the public school may not blend any "sectarian education" into its program. This apparent paradox leads us to a consideration of our third absolute in church-state law—the unconstitutionality of religious teaching or practices in the public schools—even when they are conducted on a truly voluntary basis.

#### III. THE SECULAR ORIENTATION OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL

Mr. Justice Rutledge, dissenting in *Everson*, gave as a reason for the *Pierce* decision his conviction that children should not be required to attend public schools because "their atmosphere is wholly secular." While it would be difficult to prove or disprove that the Supreme Court has agreed that the public school must have an atmosphere that is wholly secular the Court would seem to be pointing in that direction.

If the Supreme Court in its present term declares the reading of the Bible and the recitation of the Lord's prayer to be unconstitutional in a public school the secularization of the public school will be, at least in popular opinion, considerably extended. In



a certain sense, however, the reasoning of the Court in the Bible-reading case will be more important than the result reached. The Court can develop a line of reasoning employed in the past and forbid Bible reading as contrary to the establishment clause—even if no infringement of religious liberty is found to be present. The Court seems to have followed this reasoning in the Engel decision although the fact of State authorship of the prayer involved in that case made the Court's decision unique.

Very few scholars and no group of religionists have sought to explore the implications of the Supreme Court's recently developed interpretation of the establishment clause as constituting a source of rights independently of the free exercise-of-religion clause. The theory that the establishment clause is merely instrumental to the implementation of the free exercise clause has been rejected by the Court. And by this rejection the Court has opened up the following possible arguments on behalf of the constitutionality of aid for private schools:

1. Can religionists claim that the secularized public school violates the establishment clause because it prefers irreligion over religion?

2. Can religionists claim further that the state by assisting only the secularized school subscribes to and promotes an orthodoxy which is imposed on all students to whom by law the state has given a pledge of a free education unaffected by any officially established indoctrination?

Let us search through these ideas in the light of the recent Supreme Court interpretation of the establishment clause.

#### 1. Secularized schools and the establishment clause

The theory advanced by Mr. Justice Black in *Torcaso*, *McGowan* and *Engel* that the establishment clause can be violated without a violation of the free exercise of religion clause may now have become an accepted part of Supreme Court jurisprudence. Under this interpretation of the first amendment can it be argued that the secularization of the public school amounts to a violation of the establishment clause since a particular form of religion (or irreligion) is given a preferential status? If such a violation of the establishment clause can be shown, Catholics or others can enjoy it even though there is no infringement of anyone's religious freedom.

Aside from the question of standing to sue, can religious parents prove a violation of the establishment clause if the state gives financial assistance only to the school where education is deliberately divorced from religion? Preferential treatment to irreligion would seem to be as constitutionally objectionable as any preference given to religion.

Some Catholics have asserted that attendance at a public school by their children violates or restricts the religious freedom of both children and parents. The assertion is made that Catholics have a right to be treated like conscientious objectors or like Jehovah's Witnesses who have been granted an exemption from laws requiring a flag salute in a public school.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter saw the force of this analogy when, dissenting in *Barnette*, he voted against granting an exemption from the flag salute to children conscientiously opposed to the practice. Mr. Justice Frankfurter saw the consequences of the Court's bowing to the religious scruples of a minority and raised this question:

"What of the claims of equality of treatment of those parents who, because of religious scruples, cannot send their children to public schools?"

This potential argument of the Catholic or other parent has not been developed or litigated. To be able to show that religious

parents "because of religious scruples cannot send their children to public schools" (to use Mr. Justice Frankfurter's language) would seem to require more proof of an anti-religious bias in the public school than would appear to be now provable.

It is not now necessary, however, to have such proof before one can claim rights by reason of the first amendment. Under the interpretation of the establishment clause adopted in recent years by the Supreme Court any preferential treatment granted by the state to religion or irreligion constitutes a violation of constitutional rights. The allegation that is difficult to prove is, of course, the assertion that the secularized public school gives preferential treatment to irreligion. The widespread and deeply held conviction persists that silence about religion in the public school is the same as neutrality or impartiality. On this basic conception is built the whole thesis that the public school can be fair to believers and nonbelievers by assuming that their differences for the purposes of education are without significance. It is this basic assumption of the public school which, it is submitted, violates the letter and the spirit of the establishment clause.

The secularized public school meets and treats its students only as future citizens. Their religious or spiritual beliefs are to be regarded as irrelevant and hence unimportant with respect to the entire educational process. It is this basic disregard of the great ideas and religious aspirations in the lives of the students in a public school which is the gravamen of the religionist's complaint. To the believer—at least to many believers—the silent assumption by the public school that religion in any meaningful sense is irrelevant to the educational process amounts to an official establishment of secular values.

#### 2. Secularized schools and the ideal of a free education

Two of the greatest ideas underlying American democracy were born in the mid-19th century; they are the pledge of the State to give a free education to every child in an atmosphere not affected by a sectarian orientation. When these twin ideals emerged more than a century ago their fulfillment was relatively easy in a pan-Protestant nation. Today, however, in a religiously pluralistic society those ideals have become more difficult to realize because the nondenominational pan-Protestant environment of the common school has been largely displaced by a secularistic orientation. The tendency of the law from *Everson* to *Engel* has been to make mandatory the secularization of the public school without at the same time providing for a free education in a school without a secularistic orientation.

The denial of public funds to church-related schools means in effect that the ideal of a free education in an atmosphere apart from any officially fixed indoctrination has been compromised. The important thing here to prove, of course, is that there is a secularistic indoctrination which accompanies an education in the public school. This is the most important and the most difficult point of dispute in the entire controversy over public funds for private schools. But in a nation whose law knows no heresy and whose legal institutions support no orthodoxy how is it possible to reject the contention made by a substantial minority of citizens that the tax-supported school by its silent disregard of religion thereby promotes irreligion? This, of course, is the essence of the Catholic parent's case and no satisfactory answer seems to have been given.

It is uncertain what American law would say if tomorrow all the Catholics of the Nation withdrew all their children from the public schools because of their conviction

that the secularistic orientation of these schools was destructive of the faith of their children. American courts could compel the children to return to the public schools or could give financing for schools consistent with the consciences of Catholics.

American law today confronts the situation where about half of all the Catholic children of the Nation have withdrawn from the public school because of a profound disagreement with the approach to education and to life which that institution has adopted. American society and American law do not seem concerned that these children who for compelling religious reasons have forfeited the education offered to them must be thereby deprived of their right to share in the commitment of the state to provide a free education for every future citizen.

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It seems clear that many converging forces have precipitated the national debate about the advisability of parochial schools sharing in some part of Federal aid to education if such assistance is authorized by the Congress. The debate is filled with anomalies the most curious of which is the fact that no controversy exists at the State level over parochial schools since at that level the question was resolved in the last century when virtually all States enacted laws prohibiting the distribution of public funds to sectarian schools. In the Federal aid controversy Catholic spokesmen are in effect asserting that this policy embraced in the last century by the States is not a wise or fair one for the Federal Government to follow.

Cogent arguments exist to support the Catholic contention. Among them are the following:

1. The fully accredited private school has important public dimensions in that it carries out the secular goals of the State; because of this semipublic status conferred on the private school this institution has some claim to share in the public funds set aside by the State for the education of all of its future citizens.

2. Public welfare benefits surely include secular education and by the rulings in *Cochran* and *Everson* the benefits extended by the State to all citizens may not be denied to anyone, because of his religious faith or lack of it.

3. In the distribution of these public welfare benefits no Supreme Court opinion has held that the only constitutional formula is one which prevents even some incidental aid to religion. The Sunday law decisions in fact expressly hold that the state is not precluded from implementing its secular goals in a way which bestows some collateral benefits on religion.

4. In view of clear Supreme Court rulings precluding sectarian teaching and religious practices in public schools it can be persuasively argued that the granting of funds only to the public school is a violation of the establishment clause because such a policy endorses and prefers one educational and philosophical orthodoxy over all others. This is the very essence of the Catholic case.

It seems fair to conclude that neither the Congress nor the Supreme Court of the United States have confronted the claim which is being made by parents who are dissenters from the orthodoxy which the public school represents. No quotation seems more appropriate to express their sentiments and to affirm the spirit with which the entire controversy over church-related schools should be discussed than the ringing words of Mr. Justice Jackson in the *Barnette* decision:

"If there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein."

# CAPTIVE UKRAINE, COSSACKIA AND A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the past month the editors of the Washington Star performed a most valuable public service by publishing an article and several letters dealing with the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. They deserve our highest praise, and I for one congratulate them on their contribution to public enlightenment in our Nation's Capital on a subject of most fundamental importance to our national security and to our chances for victory in the cold war. I presume, however, that our State Department's goal is a victory in the cold war.

## NEED FOR A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

The material published in the Star points up more than anything else the undeniable need for a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. Unlike the haphazard perfunctory, and careless hearings and reports of a subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee last year, such a special committee would seriously address itself to the captive nations issue, with particular stress on captive Ukraine, Cossackia, Byelorussia, and all other captive non-Russian nations and peoples in the Soviet Union. The Star has helped immensely in showing how important it is for our citizens to know about these captive nations in the very front yard of Moscow's vast colonial empire.

Mr. Speaker, despite the broad, popular demand for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, the 87th Congress failed to establish this necessary committee in the House. The several maneuvers used to sidetrack this vital issue have by no means discouraged our citizenry to see such an indispensable committee created. We look forward to the creation of this committee in the 88th Congress. Periodically, more evidence will be furnished as to why this special committee is desperately needed for our people and our country in the struggle against Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism. For the moment, the published material in the Star should stimulate the interest and concern of every Member in this Chamber.

## THE WASHINGTON STAR CONTRIBUTION

Mr. Speaker, I request that at the conclusion of my remarks the following material, making up the Washington Star contribution, be printed for the interest of our Members in the Record: First, the eloquent article on "The Ukraine and You," by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, in the Sunday Star, January 27, 1963; second, the two letters on "The Ukraine and You" in the Sunday Star, February 3, 1963; third, two letters

"The Ukraine and You' Plus Some Others" attacking Dr. Harris and also Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, in the Evening Star, February 6; fourth, a letter, "Knows the Ukraine," in the Sunday Star, February 10; fifth, the full text of the reply by Dr. Dobriansky, which for want of space was published almost in its entirety under the caption "Captive Ukraine and 'Holy Mother Russia' Complex" in the Evening Star, February 14; and sixth, the letter, "Cossackia," in the Sunday Star, February 17.

## MOSCOW ATTACKS ROCKEFELLER AND OTHERS

In addition, highly pertinent to this Star material are the simultaneous attacks unleashed by Moscow against Governor Rockefeller and others in connection with our Ukrainian Independence Day celebrations in this country. It is evident that colonial Moscow seeks to conceal from the world the captive status of Ukraine and for that matter all the other captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. With a Special Committee on the Captive Nations we could develop worldwide knowledge in showing the imperio-colonial system that exists in the U.S.S.R.

Mr. Speaker, as an example of the Moscow and puppet attacks against our leaders, I request that the January 23 Associated Press release be printed in the Record, followed by a report on "Violent Soviet Reaction to Ukraine's Independence Celebration," which appeared on February 21 in Amerika, a leading Ukrainian and English language daily in this country:

## THE UKRAINE AND YOU

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate)

The independence of the Ukraine, now a non-Russian captive nation, was proclaimed on January 22, 1918. On the 45th anniversary of that light which failed until truth crushed to earth shall rise again, the cause of that dauntless people, yearning to breathe free, was lifted up to the God of justice in the prayer, offered by a representative of the Ukrainian Church, which opened the U.S. Senate. To the petitions there offered for fetters to be broken there echoed the fervent "amen" of over 2 million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry.

To a recently held congress of these fine citizens of this free land came felicitations from 33 State Governors, 40 U.S. Senators, and 140 Members of the House, where a vital bill for a permanent captive nations committee is now pending. In this convention the voice of the Governor of New York was also heard as he cried out, "We protest with you against the Soviet persecution of millions for their Jewish faith. We deplore the Red oppression of the Ukrainian Catholic and Ukrainian Orthodox Churches. This convention is a sobering reminder to all the world that the cold war at many times and places is not cold at all—it cost the lives of men like Lev Rebet and Stepan Bandera, two Soviet-murdered Ukrainian underground leaders." To this council there was added a ringing salute from President Kennedy, declaring that the just aspirations and rights of all people to choose their own rulers "is and will remain a basic goal of U.S. world policy."

Now what is the truth regarding the Ukraine—a territory a little larger than Texas? This fair land, with its face always toward the West, richly endowed with nat-

ural resources, with a favorable climate conducive to the raising of various crops, has long been called the granary of Europe. It is now the breadbasket and the sugar bowl of the U.S.S.R. But the salient historic fact is that the Ukrainian people are not Russian and their country has never belonged to Russia except by physical force. A thousand years ago their culture and commerce were at high levels but always these fiercely independent-minded people had to fight predatory neighbors. In 1709 Czar Peter I, by his military might, annexed the Ukraine as a conquered province. The long years that followed are valiant with the struggle to gain freedom. When at long last the 1917 Bolshevik revolution pulverized the sovereignty of the Czar, a new day of glorious emancipation seemed to gild the long darkened sky. In the ancient city of Kiev, as bells of freedom rang out, the Independent National Republic was proclaimed.

But, that proved to be but a fleeting dream. The rapacious arms of Soviet aggression, using their familiar upside down jargon, called the Kremlin manipulated regime they imposed "The Ukraine Soviet Socialist Republic." It was the anniversary of the Ukrainian vow to be free which was observed in the Senate of the United States. The 2 score years plus 5 which have passed since that January 22d are written in crimson letters of heartless cruelty. The blood of a martyred host cries from the ravaged ground. It is a record of imposed famine, genocide, deportation, torture, and liquidation. In spite of these fiery trials the population of the Ukraine is presently over 40 million.

Religious leaders have suffered persecution matching that of the early church. Thousands of Christian churches and chapels have been desecrated. Over 200 literary Ukrainian men and women have paid with their lives because they scorned to dip their pen in the venom of the Communist line.

To this day a saintly archbishop, Metropolitan Slipy, languishes in barren, cold Siberian dungeons sentenced to degrading servitude. He has spent 17 of his 71 years in that blasphemous captivity because he has refused to bow the knee to a pagan Baal in the image of a subservient church hierarchy in his homeland.

The voice of a Ukrainian poet of a hundred years ago, who died during Lincoln's first year in the White House, yet speaketh. His name, Taras Shevchenko. His message is about to be amplified to all Americans, as well as loyal Ukrainians, and we might add, to the Russians too. To honor him the American Congress has authorized the erection of a statue which will be a perpetual prayer in stone. That sculptured form is now being fashioned and will be erected near the Capitol in Washington. Listen to the prophetic song of Shevchenko ringing clear across a hundred years:

It makes a great difference to me  
That evil folk and wicked men  
Attack our Ukraine once so free  
And rob and plunder it at will.  
That makes a great difference to me.

In 1963 that is still the sad story of the Ukraine, and, it makes a great difference to this sweet land of liberty.

In the pathos of Shevchenko's lines is mirrored the plight of all the other captive nations, including Latvia, Lithuanian, Hungary, Rumania, and now Cuba, and all the rest, held in the grip of Soviet colonialism. That makes a difference, a great difference, to the United States of America.

There is a silence that is not golden but craven concerning captive nations. In a world that cannot permanently remain half slave and half free, calloused indifference as the policy of any so-called democracy not only dooms the captives now in foreign



letters but also passes the sentence of ultimate death upon its own freedom. Yes, it makes a great difference to you and the Ukraine—and to the whole world of tomorrow.

#### THE UKRAINE AND YOU

The article by Dr. Harris on "The Ukraine and You" is one of the most magnificent pieces I've ever read. As a student of East European history, I heartily congratulate Dr. Harris for his excellent grasp of this vital subject and thank him for the public service he has been performing through his instructive column, "Spines of the Spirit."

In the real struggle against Soviet Russian imperialism, Ukraine and the other captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. constitute our most formidable weapon in the cold war. Unfortunately, this fact is not sufficiently understood in the highest quarters of our Government. I strongly suggest that copies of Dr. Harris' article be sent to the White House, the Secretary of State, Mr. Rostow, and Senator Fulbright. There is enough documentary proof to show the deficient understanding each of these has displayed with regard to the makeup of the U.S.S.R. Dr. Harris' brilliant article might inspire them to undertake some serious research on the majority of non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.

MARY KUST.

So little is known in this country about Ukraine, and so often is it appended to Russia, that every truthful bit of information on the subject is welcome. And Dr. Harris' fine feature is not only truthful, but also bursting with deep sympathy and friendliness toward the hapless Ukrainian people—one of the first victims of Russian Communist imperialism and one of the greatest martyrs in the history of mankind.

G. D. CORBETT.

#### "THE UKRAINE AND YOU" PLUS SOME OTHERS

The recent article, "The Ukraine and You," by Dr. Frederick B. Harris, repeats some shocking misinformation about the Ukraine.

It should be remembered that: (1) The population of the Ukraine had never voted concerning separation from Russia; (2) a handful of separatists which proclaimed the separation of the Ukraine from Russia 45 years ago was not supported by the people and fled to get help from the German Army; (3) the present leaders of emigre Ukrainian separatists have no formal or moral right to speak in the name of the population of the Ukraine.

The above points were made by Andrey A. Diky in the January 19, 1963, issue of the New York anti-Soviet Russian language daily *Novoye Russkoye Slovo*. I know that they are true and I, therefore, endorse them.

The greatest guilt of the Ukrainian separatist emigres however is that their leader, Lev Dobriansky, so thoroughly misinformed the U.S. Congress that the so-called Captive Nations U.S. Public Law 86-90 even includes several mythical "nations," such as "Cossackia." This makes an aggressive farce out of the present congressional approach to the captive nations question, in spite of the glowing references to it by Dr. Harris. (According to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Dobriansky claims that it was he who substantially provided and wrote the clauses in addition to the basic ideas of that law.)

Fifteen permanent tenure and emeriti professors of 12 American universities have joined me in a published statement which condemns the present form of that law and calls for its repeal since it aims at the complete dismemberment of Russian territories.

To expose the hoaxes of the "Captive Nations" law, I hereby formally offer to pay \$1,000 to the first person who will be able

to prove to a properly constituted arbitration commission of American historians that there ever was a nation called Cossackia the national independence of which—according to the U.S. Public Law 86-90—was subjugated by the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia.

This particular clearest point is easiest for me to deal with since I am a former Don Cossack officer who had fought the Reds in south Russia so that I know that there was no Cossackia in existence then or later.

As an American citizen for over 20 years I cannot remain indifferent when Dr. Harris succumbs to the false propaganda of people whom I have dubbed the merchants of hate. In these days of menacing nuclear holocaust such things should be of the gravest concern to every American.

GREGORY P. TSCHEBOTARIOFF,  
Professor of Civil Engineering, Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.

After reading Dr. Frederick Brown Harris' sermon on freedom abstract and freedom specifically for the Ukrainians, I have found the answer to why the men of the cloth have so little effect in the councils of men despite their moral posture.

To carry influence, eloquence is one of the more superficial requisites; many more important is a cleavage to the truth and the avoidance of that opportunistic bias lightly mistaken for patriotism.

Indeed, Dr. Harris, what are the facts about the Ukraine? First of all the Ukrainians are related to the Russians by race, religion, common cultural heritage, and even common enemies. In his statement about the Ukrainians fighting for their freedom from predatory neighbors for 1,000 years he avoids mentioning that those predators were not the Russians, but the Tatars, Turks, Lithuanians, and Poles. This is a neat bit of semantics for the gist of the article leads the reader to the desired wrong assumption.

It is a matter of historic record that the Ukrainians under Ataman Bogdan Khmelnytsky, in 1653, 30 odd years before Peter the Great was born, when the ravages of their neighbors were becoming too great to bear alone, voted to be under the eastern Czar who was like them, "of the same race and Orthodox religion." It was the time of the Cossacks' fight for survival against rapacious Poland, whose troops were absorbed by the Holy Father in Rome of all sins in their aggression against the schismatics.

True, at the time of the battle of Poltava, Peter the Great's erstwhile friend, the Hetman Mazepa, betrayed him and went over to the Swedes. But, the majority of Ukrainians were loyal and thus Charles XII, one of the long line of would-be conquerors of barbaric, but rich, Russia, was utterly defeated and fled ignominiously to the fat pasha in the Divine Porte.

Later czars and czarinas pushed the Poles back to Poland proper. (This process was completed after World War II with the Soviet's addition of the Carpathians, the Galicians and the Bukovenians to the Ukraine—not to mention the millions of Ukrainians who were in prewar Poland.) The wicked czars continued the battles of the Cossacks and pushed, first the Crimean Tartars and then the Turks beyond the northern shores of the Black Sea. Thus all the Dnieper and the Crimea became a part of the great Ukraine one sees carved, way beforehand, by the assorted emigres and their not disinterested backers.

A little scholarly reading of history, instead of satisfying perusals of sensational Jesuit, German (Kaisers or Nazis) and other poop-sheets will show why—despite all the differences real and imagined, between these two closely related peoples, neither the Roman Catholic Church, Poland, Turkey, the Swedes, Napoleon, the Kaiser, or Hitler, have ever been able to sunder the Union.

And now as a contrast let's look at our little glass house. How, good Doctor, was the Confederacy kept in our Union? Did we allow the ballot box or the will of a dissident people to rule supreme in their desire to go their own way? Didn't we use the overwhelming wealth and power of the North to destroy this aspiration and to fasten a rigid military dictatorship over the conquered provinces? What happened to that pure American type freedom we had preached to all the wicked world of centralized governments? We found that we, too, could not afford that objective freedom, for there were too many practical considerations, sometime called Manifest Destiny, but all ending in the inviolability of the sacred Union.

RUSSELL FORREST.

#### KNOWS THE UKRAINE

Being of Ukrainian descent, I resent letters criticizing the Ukraine article by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris. He has given the true picture of the situation. I know, because my parents came to America from the Ukraine and they speak of their homeland as a beautiful, fertile country taken over by the Russians. I also resent being classed with the Russians. The Ukrainian people are an entirely different people, with customs all their own. They are, as a whole, gentle, peace-loving Catholics, as compared to the fiery, aggressive Russians.

OLGA B. ROYLANCE.

#### CAPTIVE UKRAINE AND HOLY MOTHER RUSSIA COMPLEX

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EVENING STAR:

Since my name was injected into an issue of crucial importance to our foreign policy and national security, I trust you will afford me the opportunity of replying in full text to the Tschebotarioff and Forrest letters. Not only does Dr. Harris have my warmest congratulations on his recent masterpiece "The Ukraine and You," but also my compliments go to the Star's editors for bringing to public view these two excellent examples of calculated disinformation and apology for traditional Russian imperialism, both Czarist and Soviet.

Considering the Tschebotarioff letter first, it was most intriguing for me to learn that allegedly I have the honor of leading "Ukrainian separatist emigres." If with some respect for truth the writer had checked biographical sources, such as "Who's Who in America," he would have found this to be an impossible characterization. I have never led any such group, nor could I, by virtue of birth, loyalty, and thorough American training. This low level of credibility features both letters.

As the record plainly shows, my scholarly and educational endeavors have been directed at a comprehensive understanding by our people of the Soviet Russian imperial-colonial system that prevails in the U.S.S.R. By all evidence this system is the most vulnerable sector in the expanded empire of Moscow. The persistent struggle for independence and freedom by all the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. against the one remaining imperialist system in the world is of the same spirit and substance as our own American Revolution. Once we understand and appreciate this fundamental truth, tremendous opportunities for our victory in the cold war will be open to us. Glimmers of such opportunities have already appeared in the U.N. debates on Soviet Russian colonialism, Congress passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution, the Captive Nations Week observances, and many other events. Moscow's reactions have been most defensive and fearful.

The interesting aspect of my endeavors has been the discovery that a common denominator of an imperialist "Holy Mother Russia" complex exists between Soviet Russian

propagandists and numerous Russian and Russified emigres and their unknowing friends who, despite the privileges of American citizenship, would misguide us in not exploring this whole new non-Russian dimension in the U.S.S.R. Every argument and position taken in these two letters exemplifies this; even the terms are meaningful. For example, the term, "Ukrainian separatist emigre" is a favorite Russian usage applied to Ukrainian patriots, and as shown just last October in the Stashynsky trial in West Germany, even the mighty Khrushchev had out of fear to order the assassination of two Ukrainian emigre leaders.

The fantasies about Ukraine not voting separation from Russia, a handful of separatists proclaiming independence, and Ukrainian emigres not having a moral right to speak in behalf of their captive homeland are also familiar Soviet Russian tunes. These typical Russianistic distortions of the histories of conquered nations are easily contradicted by the Ukrainian Congresses held in 1917, from which delegates were elected to form the independent Republic, the recognition by the Russian Council of People's Commissars in December 1917 of "the Ukrainian National Republic and its right to full separation from Russia," and after the rape of independent Ukraine and its forced incorporation into the U.S.S.R., the existence of article 17 in the U.S.S.R. Constitution, "The right freely to secede from the U.S.S.R. is reserved to every Union Republic."

A measure of commonsense on these Soviet Russian responses to the Ukrainian drive for independence should alone suggest that they weren't made in a vacuum but rather with an eye to the expressed popular will of the historic Ukrainian nation. If the reader is not familiar with this history, he can consult the compact bibliography on Ukraine and other captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., published in the February 4 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. From our American viewpoint in the cold war, we should press the present Russian imperio-colonialists to demonstrate under U.N. auspices the "free right" the Ukrainian people have to secede from the Union.

Another striking identity of position between the first letter and Soviet Russian propaganda is their opposition to the Captive Nations Week resolution. From the time I worked on this resolution with former Congressman Cretella of Connecticut in 1958 to the very present, it has been quite educational to see who and what groups in this country have lined up with Khrushchev in denouncing the resolution. Invariably, those bred in the Russian political environment and their few friends have supported the hands-off position on Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. Americans who for some time have understood this problem in our midst (e.g. James Bundy, Containment or Liberation? p. 236) have wondered on whose side these people will be when a showdown comes; and this includes the 15 professors cited in the first letter. Needless to say, we've had many other university professors in this country sympathetic to the various policies of imperial Moscow.

Finally, as concerns Cossackia, it doesn't surprise me that the first writer shows little appreciation of the national sinews binding the Cossack people. His outlook is so totalitarian Russian that he no longer recognizes his own ancestry. Such Russified types have been the ripe products of systematic Russification both under the white and red czars. As Lenin once pointed out, they even out-Russianize the chauvinist Russians. However, since he resorted to the rather cheap pecuniary bravado of offering \$1,000 to prove the points on Cossackia and since the Star publicized this, I suggest that in behalf of public enlightenment the Star

arrange for the formation of a committee of competent scholars, here and abroad, to judge this. There are many intellectual Americans of Cossack ancestry who would be willing to oblige in showing the Cossack struggle against Russian domination and Cossackia's declaration of independence in 1918. In fact, if the engineer has any \$1,000 bonuses to offer on Idel-Ural, Turkestan, and the non-Russian entities of North Caucasia, the editors could rest assured of an enthusiastic Moslem response. This would be one effective way of informing our people about the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., our allies in the cause of universal freedom.

As for the Forrest letter, its anticlerical tone and Russian version of Ukrainian history are enough to substantiate my several comments above. However, here, too, it is important to observe the selfsame arguments used by Moscow for free world consumption. Indeed, the writer almost competes with Khrushchev as a defender of the enforced union of Ukraine with Russia. His version of the actual military treaty between Khmelnytsky's Ukraine and Muscovy in 1654 is exactly the same version found in Tass' "Theses on the Tercentenary of the Reunion of the Ukraine with Russia—1654 to 1954." A military treaty is scarcely an organic union. Significantly, both fail to mention that after Moscow, in typical Russian fashion, broke the treaty and attempted to enslave Ukraine, the two were at war in 1659. The words of Hetman Vyhovskiy, leading the Ukrainian forces then, are strikingly pertinent for our times: "The treacherous action of Moscow was apparent in preparing for us a slavery primarily by means of instigating a civil war in Ukraine."

The writer's comments on Mazeppa and the war against the Russian tyrant, Peter the Great, are also sheer fabrications which one often finds in Soviet Russian adulations of the empire-builder. Imagine, in this Nation dedicated to the freedom and independence of all nations, the writer has the gall also to extol Russia's tyrants for consolidating Ukraine's territories, which only meant the conquest of the entire nation as a springboard for further Russian expansionism. Lastly, his reference to the Confederacy as an analogy to the Russo-Ukrainian situation—which Moscow also employs from time to time—doesn't even make logical sense in the framework of his own argument. Ours was a nation divided; Ukraine and Russia are two distinct nations, the latter imprisoning the former in sacred union.

Isn't it significant that while Dr. Harris is being attacked for his American insights into the 45th anniversary of Ukraine's independence by the Russia-first cabal in this country, Moscow attacks Governor Rockefeller for his proclamation of the event (AP, January 23, Moscow)? The common denominator shows itself again. As we continue to flush out the exponents of the "Holy Mother Russia" complex—those who view Ukraine, Armenia, Georgia, etc., as "traditional parts of the Soviet Union" (e.g. Secretary Rusk's letter to Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH, Aug. 22, 1961)—the ground will be set for the exposure of the worst imperio-colonial system in modern history, the Russian one in the U.S.S.R. itself. As he's demonstrated so often, Khrushchev has nightmares over this; we have a cold war to win with this.

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,  
Georgetown University.

#### "COSSACKIA"

Yes, Professor Tschebotarioff, there was a Cossackia, a nation which consisted of the territory where you were born yourself, and which was populated by your own people, the Don Cossacks. In the Russian empire this territory was called "The region of the

Don Host," and in the Soviet Union this region is now called "The Rostov on the Don region."

It was after the Russian Revolution of 1917 that the Don Cossacks proclaimed this territory and its people an independent nation. Its first president was Don Cossacks Gen. Bogayevsky African Petrovich. That was the nation, which was mentioned in the American Congress' resolution on the Captive Nations Week. Congress called it "Cossackia" because of the difficulties of pronunciation of the archaic name, Vsevelikoye Voisko Donskoye.

But I do not pretend to get the professor's money. I ask him to send \$500 to the Jew's Home for the Old and \$500 for the Ukrainian Home for Old Age. Perhaps there now are living there old men and women who in their youth were beaten by the long whips in which Don Cossacks officers used to delight.

MRS. A. SYCINSKY.

#### MOSCOW ATTACKS GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER FOR PROCLAIMING "UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY"

Moscow, January 23.—The news agency Tass reported today a "groundswell of indignation" among the working people of Ukraine over New York Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller's proclamation of a "Ukrainian Independence Day."

Tass quoted from letters of workers, one of whom denounced Rockefeller as a "capitalist who has waxed rich on the blood and sweat of millions."

Earlier this week the Governor proclaimed yesterday as "Ukrainian Independence Day," calling it a gesture of "our keen sympathies" with the Ukrainian people's hope for freedom.

Without saying how the people in Ukraine learned of the proclamation, Tass cited these reactions from among the "numerous letters" received from Ukrainians:

Piotr Stepanchuk, building worker, "hero of Socialist labor" and deputy of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet: "Look who is showing concern for us; Rockefeller, a capitalist who waxed rich on the blood and sweat of millions of people \* \* \*. My people do not need aid from anybody \* \* \* to our self-appointed benefactor from abroad I say, Don't butt your nose, Mr. Rockefeller, into our Soviet home."

Nikolai Tarnavsky, a writer who Tass said lived 49 years in the United States: "Don't make like simpletons. The people of the whole world are well aware that it is your famous America that lacks freedom. What goes on in your Southern States? The Ukrainian people freed themselves long ago, as far back as 1917, when they did away with the rule of the czars and such magnates as you."

Vasili Rubanik, chairman of a collective farm: "We do not want your freedom. We have no use for it. American correspondents who visited our collective farm last year expected to see dilapidated huts, but they saw spacious houses, they saw abundance instead of misery. You ask about this from Lauren Soth, the editor of the Des Moines (Iowa) Register-Tribune, and other newsmen. They could not understand how it was possible in such short time and after a devastating war to achieve such success."

#### VIOLENT SOVIET REACTION TO UKRAINE'S INDEPENDENCE CELEBRATIONS

NEW YORK.—Observances of the 45th anniversary of Ukraine's independence by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America throughout the United States and especially the solemn observances in the U.S. Congress evoked violent reaction in the Soviet Union. Immediately after the proclamations of "Ukrainian Independence Day" were issued by American Governors and after prayers



were delivered by Ukrainian clergymen in Congress, a number of Governors, especially Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York, and other American officials, U.S. Senators were assailed by the Moscow radio for taking part in these observances. Subsequently, a series of articles, caricatures, verses, and other satiric and abusive reports appeared in the following Soviet organs in Moscow and Kiev: *Izvestia* (January 24, 1963), *Pravda* (January 23, 1963), *Izvestia* (January 25, 1963, and article by Lubomyr Dmyterko, member of the Ukrainian S.S.R. mission to the U.N. in New York), all of which were in the Russian language and printed in Moscow, and *Radyanska Ukraina* (January 24, 1963), *Molod Ukraina* (January 26, 1963), and *Robotnycha Hazeta* (January 24, 1963), in the Ukrainian language in Kiev. Also *Pravda Ukrainy*, a Russian-language daily appearing in Kiev, on January 24, 1963, printed a vitriolic article against the observances of Ukrainian independence in the United States.

All these articles are replete with accusations of "American imperialism" and protestations that the Ukrainian people were "liberated" in December 1917 (reference to the establishment of a Soviet puppet regime in Kharkiv), and that the United States need not worry about the present position of the Ukrainian people.

#### QUOTA ALLOCATIONS FOR IMPORTATION OF RESIDUAL OIL

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NYGAARD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, last week I requested and received permission to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a letter I had addressed to the Secretary of the Interior asking that the proposed new quota allocations for importation of residual oil be withheld until such time as interested Congressmen had had an opportunity to review them. I have not been notified of an announcement of these allocations, and I understand unofficially that conferences have been arranged between Department of the Interior officials and Members objecting to increases in import levels.

I find it hard to believe that the economic welfare of the U.S. workers could be deliberately sacrificed on the altar of foreign political expediency. Surely the administration cannot rate Venezuelans as more important than its own citizens. Yet if the President chooses to accept the recommendations contained in the Office of Emergency Planning report, that is what his action will signify.

Mr. McDermott's view that hemispheric solidarity—whatever that means—must be achieved at any cost, does not add up to sound thinking.

Does he think Venezuela would permit the United States to sell uncontrolled amounts of a waste product to it where this would compete unfairly with one of its industries and deprive Venezuelans of jobs? Of course it would not.

It is a strange foreign policy, indeed, where our Government is solicitous of

and caters to the people of other nations to the detriment of U.S. citizens. Sure we know we are fighting communism in Latin America. But what guarantee do we have, no matter what we do, that Venezuela will not succumb to the techniques and ideas of this insidious Soviet philosophy?

We believe in a policy of imports and exports that operates in the interest of the people of the United States. What advantage do we obtain by favoring a nation of dubious importance and questionable stability at the expense of our own citizens? Self-interest is just good national commonsense. Could it be that commonsense has flown out the windows of the ivory towers in which the administration's economic and political pundits concoct their fanciful theories?

You may ask, Mr. President, why North Dakota way out in the Midwest is so seriously concerned with imports of residual oil into east coast markets. The answer is relatively simple. The dislocation or elimination of big coal markets on the east coast through inequitable oil competition has a marked effect on the economy of Midwestern States.

And that is not all. North Dakota is fighting for the right to develop a major industry for the State. While coal production in recent years has been only a few million tons, we have every reason to believe that this amount can be increased manyfold because of the way demand for coal is growing in the Midwest. Did you know that North Dakota has one of the largest reserves of coal in the country, a grand total of recoverable deposits of 175,359 million tons?

Since the location of oil there in 1951, North Dakota has developed into one of the important States in oil production. Because of the lack of oil markets at this time, the extent of our oilfields has not been fully explored, and the continuation of imports of residual oil has had a very depressing effect upon the American oil industry as a whole.

So of course we are concerned, profoundly concerned. We have high hopes of developing industries of considerable magnitude and importance to the State from our vast oil and lignite deposits. We do not want to see them wrecked on the shoals of increasing imports of foreign residual oil.

If more residual oil pours into the east coast, big coal and oil producing States will lose more and more business, more miners and oil workers will lose jobs, more mines and oilfields will close. The railroads will sustain severe revenue losses. Many other industries and trades will be gravely injured financially. And you had better believe that the economies of many States other than those on the east coast will feel serious repercussions.

Another way of saying "big imports of residual oil" is "big economic disaster for thousands of U.S. citizens."

The economic havoc which can be wrought by the residual oil import policy fostered by the OEP report, of course, represents only half the story. Mr. McDermott also failed to face up squarely to the sober facts of national security. His so-called hemispheric solidarity may

be actually only a myth—an abstraction that can evaporate overnight. It is scant comfort when our national security is threatened, as it may well be.

You know as well as I that a communistic revolt could erupt in Venezuela overnight. Oil wells could be dynamited as they were once before. A situation could develop where Russian subs based in Cuba could disrupt oil supply lines with Venezuela.

One of the grave dangers of allowing more volumes of residual oil to flood into our east coast is that more and more defense plants will use it. Actually the only merit of residual oil is its dump price. It cannot be stockpiled—it has to be used up quickly. Consequently most companies using it would be without any fuel in a matter of days once shipments of it were cut off.

Few companies now have dual burning facilities, so they could not quickly convert to coal. Prolonged loss of markets by a shortsighted residual oil import policy also causes mines to shut down and coal production to diminish. The coal industry cannot operate on a standby basis. It could not be magically restored to production to meet the immense demands of an emergency. Our Nation might therefore suffer from economic strangulation for a considerable period when time was of the essence and it was imperative to produce war material fast.

No patriotic, clear-thinking American wants to gamble with this Nation's security through politically expedient foreign import policies. We cannot believe the President does, either.

The people of the State of North Dakota have a big stake in what would happen if residual oil imports are relaxed just as much as other coal producing States. We raise our voices, Mr. President, with utmost vehemence. We strongly protest any change in residual oil import controls. We urge this administration to reject the strange thinking of Mr. McDermott that the national security implications of the residual oil import program are irrelevant, that the economic welfare of the coal and related industries are inconsequential.

Strict controls on residual oil imports must be kept on for the security of our Nation and for the economic benefit of U.S. workers. Let us start using some commonsense. Let us solve our domestic problems first.

#### DR. WILLIAM S. MIDDLETON

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, during the period that I had the privilege of serving as Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, I came to know and admire a great man. This man, Dr. William S. Middleton, was Chief Medical Director of the VA's Department of Medicine and Surgery.

Citing his title tells you something of his position, but may actually be misleading about the man himself. For Dr. Middleton was no austere medical administrator, sitting in an office high above the arena of man's pain and suffering. The symbol of Dr. Middleton was never the plush chair and the big desk; rather, his most treasured possession, one always physically close to him, was the stethoscope he carried for the 43 years he served the University of Wisconsin Medical School, including 22 years as dean. Certainly during the time I was his associate in the Veterans' Administration, Dr. Middleton was never happier than when touring the wards of a veterans' hospital, combining his stethoscope, his magnificent brain, and his deep feeling for his fellow man in order to cure and to soothe.

On the first of March, after 8 years as Chief Medical Director, Dr. Middleton, now 73, retired. Behind him he leaves many friends, those who have known him, and those—perhaps never having heard his name—who have received better medical care as a result of his service.

Also retiring after 45 years of service to veterans is "Senator" Robinson E. "Bob" Adkins, who has been the principal administrative adviser and assistant to VA chief medical directors since October 1945.

Bob was a close friend and confidant of Dr. Middleton, the two making an admirable working team, particularly since they agreed 100 percent that VA medicine must not only continue its position in the first rank, but must never settle for less than a deep and genuine sympathy for each individual veteran, not as a patient or a case, but as a human being with a medical problem. That the Department of Medicine and Surgery has succeeded and is succeeding in this endeavor is, in large measure, due to Dr. William S. Middleton and Robinson E. Adkins.

#### INCOME TAX EXEMPTION

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, a year ago I introduced a bill which would provide an income tax exemption of an additional \$1,000 to taxpayers with dependent students in institutions of higher education. The reasons which prompted me to introduce this legislation then are still extremely valid.

Even with Federal aid in the form of student loans, housing grants, and subsidies to scientific activity, our colleges and universities have been forced to raise their tuition fees in order to meet rising costs on a fixed endowment base.

It seems only reasonable, Mr. Speaker, to give some form of support to families who are making every financial sacrifice possible in order to give their children a fine higher education. Therefore, I am

reintroducing this bill and I will continue to work for its passage as vigorously as I know how.

#### THE FRESH AIR OF COMPETITION

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Keith] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the good fortune to hear an address on the state of the economy by Dr. Charles F. Phillips, the distinguished president of Bates College. It was delivered to a meeting of the Life Underwriters Association of the District of Columbia, but deserves a much wider audience.

Dr. Phillips has a way of being very entertaining and down to earth, yet direct and incisive in his comments on the economic facts of life. I was so impressed with his remarks that I made arrangements to have the tape recording transcribed and edited for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I did so because I know that many of my colleagues have a high regard for Dr. Phillips and will want to read this very timely and pertinent speech.

With all the discussion today about economic stimulants, the controversy surrounding proposed tax measures, and the unhappy task we face in dealing with the largest peacetime budget in history, I sometimes think we often lose sight of the basic issues behind the more apparent economic problems. Dr. Phillips has not lost sight of the real issue and has placed it very ably into its proper perspective. He concludes that more than anything else, our economy needs a restoration of competition, and that this will not occur unless those of us who believe in the American system of a free economy get out and fight for the best solutions. I agree with Dr. Phillips and commend this excellent speech to the attention of my colleagues in Congress:

SPEECH OF DR. CHARLES F. PHILLIPS, PRESIDENT OF BATES COLLEGE, LEWISTON, MAINE, JANUARY 23, 1963, IN WASHINGTON, BEFORE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LIFE UNDERWRITERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. President, Mr. Chairman, members, and guests of this association, ladies and gentlemen, I want you to know how pleasant it is to be here with you this afternoon, to leave the Bates campus down in the State of Maine, to fly here so comfortably, to meet with those of you who are members of this association and your many guests and to have this chance of chatting with you for just a few minutes.

And, of course, it is especially pleasant to be introduced by one of my own distinguished colleagues from the field of education and to have so many others from the field of education here.

And since this is such a pleasant occasion from my point of view, I want to be sure equally well that it's pleasant for you. And so let me tell you right at the beginning that I plan to follow my usual practice of not chatting for very long. You see, I think all speakers should follow the advice of that

current advertisement for an electric washing machine. If you noticed it, it says, "After it spins dry, it automatically shuts itself off." [Laughter and applause.]

I don't know what agency prepared that, but I think it has very broad application [laughter] throughout many areas of American life so far as that's concerned.

Actually, though, I have another reason for chatting for a very short time today, and that's simply because I want to get back on the Bates campus. So many interesting and fascinating things have been happening there of late that I just don't want to be away any longer than I have to and miss them. For example, just to pick one, one night last spring—in fact, it was the night just before Colonel Glenn went into orbit, you remember—and a group of students, as students sometimes do, President Carroll, decided to explore a building which we were then putting up—nowhere near completed but the frame was up, and at the top—it was a science building—was a big dome; eventually, you know, it would have a track inside for the telescopes; the dome would open and the telescope would point up to the sky. And this group got in the building and went up to the top. The telescope wasn't there; the dome was and the track was there. Somehow they got this track to go around and around. It isn't supposed to now; it's supposed to go just 180 degrees and come back, and it's never been quite right since [laughter] but they did. They opened the top and placed on the revolving track an American flag which they had with them, together with a great big sign on which they had written "Good Luck Glenn." And you know what bothered me, President Carroll? You knew they were college boys—they spelled Glenn, G-l-e-n-n. [Laughter.] Who else could do this? [Laughter.] In fact, I could even pick the nearby college from which they came. [Laughter and applause.]

When something like this happens I feel exactly like that little kindergarten teacher who had one of those terrible days in class, everything has gone wrong; all of her little angels have turned into hellions. And as she was leaving for home that night one of the other teachers heard her mutter to herself, "Tomorrow I'm going to find some quicksand for them to play in" [laughter].

I came here to Washington today because I want to take you on a little trip with me. I hope you find it an interesting trip; I think it will be somewhat unusual, because what I would like to do in these very few minutes together is take you on a little space flight with me. Actually, in the couple of minutes I've been standing here, this whole room has been picked up, we have jetted to Cape Canaveral, we've been on the launching pad, we've had our blast-off, and now we're soaring. But in contrast to most space ships, we're not going to orbit around this earth; we are going to move at exactly the same speed as the earth so that in effect we place ourselves right up over the United States where we can take a bird's eye view of what's going on down here, but free from all the economic, social, and political pressures which surrounds us when we are on this earth.

And this particular spaceship has one wonderful gadget. It has a button which is right under my thumb, here, right on the podium, which if I push, backs us up just a little bit in time and then brings us forward ever so quickly to get a bird's-eye view of the last year.

I'm going to push it now and the next voice you're going to hear is that of the President of the United States a year ago, in January, when he was then giving his January message to Congress and his Economic Report was being read. And as we listen to him, we soon get the point that no President, ever in the history of the United States,



gave such an optimistic forecast as did President Kennedy just a year ago: Gross national product 521 in 1961 would go up to 570 in 1962; labor was to gain by higher wages and a decrease in unemployment; stockholders would gain by a 23-percent increase in corporate profits; consumers would benefit from an increased output of goods and services at stable prices. And we would have all of this and a balanced budget, because while spending would go up about \$3.5 billion, Government income would increase at a more rapid rate so we would end up the year with about a half-billion dollar surplus.

And as I push this gadget and we come along just a little bit in the year, we see in many ways the year is being a good year. Looking down we see some 67, 68, 69, to 70—depending on the time of the year—millions of people scurrying to work each morning against 2 or 3 million fewer people the previous year. Through our radio connections with the earth we hear cash registers ringing up new highs in retail sales; we hear the pound of hammers as home starts reach, not a new all-time high, but certainly the highest point in the previous 3 years.

But as I push this gadget and we come along a little bit more, we see that in a number of areas what's actually happening is falling substantially behind the forecast of the President. This gross national product which was to go from 521 to 570, gets around 550 and 554 and becomes very sticky. Unemployment, which was to go down month after month, reaches the 4 million range and then just hangs there. The index of production which was to go up month after month after month gets up to around 119 by midyear and then has a difficult job just to hold at that level.

In fact, some very disquieting signs develop, signs as disquieting as the experience of the man at the dentist's with a bad tooth. Said the dentist: "I'll have to pull it for you." "Oh, Doc, how much is it going to cost?" "Ten dollars." "Doc, isn't that an awful lot of money for 30 seconds' work?" "All right, I'll pull it for you more slowly, if you like." [Laughter.] This was disquieting.

And likewise it was disquieting by midyear to see a stock market tumble in 6 months about 25 percent, taking along with it some \$94 billion of paper value. It was somewhat discouraging to see this market decline give rise in the minds of many people to a worry about recession, a worry which was accentuated by a steady rise in the rate of business failures.

Even more important, we discovered by midyear that we were plowing back into plant and equipment nowhere near as much as had been our normal custom. Ten years ago we were putting back each year about 6.6 of our gross national product into expanding plant and equipment, and this is the only way a competitive economy can grow—to plow back funds into plant and equipment. Ten years ago, about 6.6 percent; last year, about 4.9 percent. In other words, we spent too much of the year living off of our past capital; we were not being as realistic as the man living the life of Riley on the town. Finally, when he began to feel a bit run down, he went to the doctor, and the doctor took one look at him, put him down in a chair and began to give him a lecture about the way he was living.

"Doc," he said, "you stop right there. I didn't come here to have you tell me I was burning the candle at both ends; I came for more wax." [Laughter.]

We just didn't use enough reinvestment.

And then, of course, by midyear, it became perfectly clear to everyone that what was to be a surplus was rapidly turning into a deficit, which is now estimated at roughly \$9 billion for the fiscal year. This deficit, in turn, has given rise to worry about the stability of the American dollar as gold has again begun to leave our country.

So here on our spaceship, Mr. Chairman, with this brief review behind us, we get together in a little huddle. We say, "Why has this happened?" On the surface, we have everything; we have fine managers, able workers, huge capital sums for investment; we have superb natural resources. Why are we growing at such a slow rate?

And the answer to this question—as seen from our spaceship, where we don't have to worry about all the pressures of events that force themselves upon us when we're down below—becomes perfectly clear the minute we ask ourselves another question: What is it that makes a competitive, private economy grow? What is the thing that encourages businessmen to take funds and reinvest them to expand their plant and equipment—literally, if you like, to create jobs?

The answer: the rate of profit. When the rate of profit is increasing and is deemed adequate, expansion takes place. When it starts going down, expansion slows up; and if it goes down rapidly enough, we go into a period of contraction.

The rate of profit is the same kind of incentive that one farmer found in the football. After painting it white, he took it out to the hen coop and dropped it in and said, "I want you gals to see what some of the ladies next door are doing." It's the same kind of incentive. [Laughter.]

But what has been happening to the rate of profit? No matter how you measure it—whether you put it in terms of percentage return on capital invested, in terms of percentage on manufacturer sales, or in terms of percentage of our total gross national product—any way you want to look at it—for 12 years it has, with minor inconsistencies, been running downhill. Twelve years ago manufacturers earning roughly 7.1 percent net, after taxes, per dollar of sales; currently they are earning about 4.3 percent.

So you ask yourself, sitting up in our spaceship, "Why did this happen?" And again it is perfectly clear. Profits are nothing but the difference between cost, including taxes, and prices and for the past 10 years we have been shrinking this margin. While the price level has gone up a bit, about 13 percent, costs have gone up much more. So year after year we have been shrinking the driving force of a competitive economy. We have been shrinking it (1) because of certain cost policies and practices which we have been following, (2) because of a 47 percent increase in average hourly earnings, and (3) because of a tax structure which today is the highest tax structure of any industrial nation of the world.

How do we get ourselves out of this situation? How do we restore the profit margin that makes Johnny run? Obviously, we cannot do it by raising prices. If we do, we will price ourselves out of the market, and we have already done a pretty good job of that. Therefore, if we want to restore our profit margin, it must be done by an all-out attack on the three factors I just mentioned which have affected our cost structure. So may I now turn to a few suggestions as to how we may get our cost structure under control.

Let me start with two illustrations of cost policies and practices which have worked to our own detriment.

First, our farm program. The basic problem, here, of course, is that we simply have too many people on our farms. When I was a youngster living on a farm it took one farmer to raise enough food to feed five people. By 1940 he could feed 10, today he can feed 20, tomorrow, meaning the middle of the next decade, he will be able to feed 40. A complete agricultural revolution has taken place and yet through Government support and loan programs we have encouraged people to remain on the farms where they continue to produce.

These programs raise prices—and remember that higher prices to the farmer means higher costs to the businessmen. They also curtail our foreign markets. In addition, we end up with the Government owning some \$8 to \$10 billions in so-called surplus products on which the annual cost just for storage is in excess of a billion dollars. I tell you this makes no sense.

How do we get out of this jam? By bringing in the fresh air of competition. When you overproduce something you must let prices go down. Don't misunderstand me, I'm not suggesting that we bankrupt our farmers. But I am suggesting that we take our price-fixing program and turn it into an insurance program. Instead of saying, "We will hold prices at a certain level," we should say to the farmer, "We won't let any great catastrophe hit you in any one year." Consequently we will guarantee that prices will not fall more than 10 percent in any particular year, but they can fall several years in a row so pressure is exerted to move people out of this part of our economy.

As a second illustration, consider the practice of featherbedding, the tendency to hang onto jobs after the economic need for these jobs has gone by. We usually think of featherbedding as existing only on our railroads. We think of the firemen—originally put on a locomotive to shovel coal—still riding the electric or the diesel today where there are neither fires to stoke nor boilers to tend. Or we think of the engine crew with its payday based upon a 100-mile trip—which made sense when the average freight went 12½ miles per hour. But today, when this distance is covered in from 2 to 4 hours, it becomes a practice of featherbedding.

Actually featherbedding is rampant throughout industry. It exists in our textile mills with the setting of the number of looms that a man is allowed to handle. It exists in our building trade, where for many jobs that practically anyone can do, we still require skilled labor. It exists in our great air transportation industry. Today's jets, easier to fly, so my good friends, air pilots tell me, easier to fly than the giant props which they are replacing, and yet on many lines still today, crews of from three to four are required where two or three can do the job.

How do we get out of this situation? Again by bringing in the fresh air of competition. By making union membership voluntary so you can join if you want to or refuse to join. It is under such conditions competitive influence can be brought to bear to put an end to this type of featherbedding practice.

Turning to our wage structure, our basic job is to educate people that the policy we have been following for a number of years doesn't make sense. This is going to be terribly difficult because the most widely accepted economic idea in the United States is that every increase in productivity must be followed by an equal increase in the average wage level. That is, the majority of our citizens believe that if the output per man-hour, which is what we mean by productivity, goes up by 2 percent in 1 year, wages should go up 2 percent; if it goes up 3 percent, wages should go up 3 percent. This idea is accepted by the present President of the United States and the one before him, which gets both political parties involved. It is deeply imbedded in many of our labor contracts. Fourteen years ago the General Motors Corp. signed its first automatic escalator clause contract with the United Auto Workers, which was based on the assumption that output per man-hour would go up 2 percent a year and, therefore, wages would go up 2 percent per year. This idea of an automatic escalator clause spread to the other automobile companies and then to

other industries and today one-third of all the labor contracts of the United States have in them automatic escalator clauses.

Despite the popularity of relating wages to productivity, I stand here in all sincerity to say to you that this idea is bad for our country, for labor, for you, and for your customers. Instead we should let this great increase in productivity reflect itself in gradually falling prices. Why do I say this? For two very simple reasons.

In the first place, if we let our increase in productivity be reflected in gradually falling prices we would raise the standard of living of everyone, not just those who are in the position to achieve higher wages. For example, during the past 20 years, the price of your private passenger car has gone up 300 percent. This means that anyone whose income, net after taxes, has not advanced 300 percent is less well off in terms of buying private passenger cars for transportation today than he was 20 years ago. Which of course means that thousands of Government employees, teachers, and retired individuals, just to select three groups at random, now have less in standard of living in this area than they had two decades ago. Whereas, had we let the tremendous increase in productive possibilities of our automobile industry be reflected in gradually falling prices, everyone would be better off—even if their wages had remained exactly as they were.

Secondly, I suggest that if we would let this increased productivity reflect itself in falling prices, we would protect, note "protect," our home markets. I don't have to say to a group like this, as knowledgeable as you are, how American manufacturers are being increasingly undercut price-wise even within our own country. A few years ago if you wanted to see any great number of foreign-made cars you had to get on a plane and go to the German autobahn, the streets of London or Paris, or to Italy's Amalfi Drive. Today you don't have to—you can see them on the highways and the byways of the United States anywhere you want to go. And what is happening in automobiles, is also happening in steel, with German cameras and typewriters, and with Japanese transistor radios and sewing machines. And the end is not yet. As I travel around the world and talk with my manufacturing friends of other nations, the one thing of which they are sure is that in the years ahead they will take over a greater share of the American market.

Now don't misunderstand me. I am not suggesting to you for one moment to go back to protectionism. Nor am I suggesting that we turn around and cut wages. And I am certainly not suggesting that labor should have no share in the growing productivity of our economy. But I am saying that labor should share in our economy on the same basis as everyone else does, no more and no less. And the only way to distribute our gains equitably is to do it through gradually falling prices which raise the standard of living of everyone, protect markets at home, and expand markets throughout the world.

As for taxes, here we must start from two obvious facts. On the one hand, taxes retard production. On the other hand, no matter what we want to do, we've got to collect great amounts of taxes. Taxes retard production by taking funds that otherwise might be reinvested in plant and equipment. It takes about \$14,000 in the United States to put a man to work—to buy the plant and equipment necessary to go along with his job. Every time we take \$14,000 out of the hands of some private company, we make it less possible for that company to create that job. But taxes do something else; they decrease individual initiative. When we have a corporate tax of 52 percent and pile on top of that a personal income tax ranging from 20 to

91 percent, we stifle the degree of initiative, make people less venturesome. It becomes much safer to put money into tax-exempt securities, rather than in new enterprises. Yet, as I just stated, we cannot have a \$94 billion budget like we have today without collecting great amounts of taxes.

What do we do when we face this kind of paradoxical situation? May I suggest that we do two very simple things. One, that we turn to those areas where we can make substantial reductions in our spending and start making those reductions. And when you have a total budget of \$94 billion it is not difficult to find soft spots. The farm program, on which I have commented already, is costing us \$5,800 million a year. Let us turn it into an insurance program with a maximum cost of \$1 billion. Our foreign aid program, of which I have been a firm supporter and into which we have put some \$63 billion since the end of World War II.

When we have cut spending—created a little elbow room—then I want to make another suggestion: a tax cut. Now I am not recommending an emergency tax cut. An emergency tax cut in which one does not know whether this will be in effect for 1 month, for 5 months, or for 5 years will not put a penny to work. What we need is a carefully thought out program in which we commit ourselves now, that over the next 10 years we will make a 1- to 2-percent gradual reduction each and every year to bring that 52 percent corporate tax down to 40 percent. We need a 4- to 6-percent reduction each year in the high personal income tax brackets to bring the 91 percent down to 50 percent over this period of time.

Will such a tax program unbalance our budget? It may. I don't lose too much sleep over that. I'd have been dead long ago, had I. We have operated on an unbalanced budget for 24 of the past 30 years. But a careful tax reduction program may not unbalance the budget. If annual reductions can be counted upon, this would spur our economy. This has happened before. Back in 1954, in the early days of the Eisenhower administration, taxes were cut by 7½ billion; yet 2 years later, because of the remarkable growth of the economy, at the lower rates we were collecting more in dollars than we were at the higher rates of 2 years before. Our economy needs this kind of stimulation. Its growth rate is too low, its unemployment rate is too high.

Now let's leave our spaceship. It has landed, the capsule has opened, we are walking around the United States. And all of a sudden we feel the pressures that we did not feel up in free space. We feel the social pressures, the economic pressures, the political pressure. Can we do the things we talked about while up in space? Can we put them into effect? Can we do these things necessary to stimulate the growth of our economy? Obviously we cannot do them in the clearcut fashion that I have just suggested. The farm vote is too strong to turn the farm program overnight into an insurance program; the strength of labor is too great to bring unions under our anti-trust laws overnight. The desires for spending are too great to achieve quick reductions.

And so I am saying to you that if you are realistic, you won't look for all of these things to happen quickly. You won't look for the economy to take off as rapidly as it could if we were willing to do these things. Does this make you pessimistic? Do you react to it like the old cow munching in the field and, seeing a tank of milk going by with a sign, "Our milk is pasteurized, homogenized, standardized," turning to a neighboring muncher to say, "Doesn't that sign make you feel sort of inadequate?" Is that the way you react? Or do you come up fighting? Do you come up like the two babes walking down Broadway with a sailor

following about 10 paces behind. After an hour of this, one of the babes turned to him and said, "Look, stupid, stop following us, or at least have enough gumption to go and find another sailor." Do you come up like that? We need to recognize whether you like it or not, that life is a compromise. It always has been. We have compromised with inflation since 1900 because basically, since 1900, we have had a rising price level. We have compromised with the devaluation of the dollar before—in the early days of the Roosevelt administration when we took the ounce of gold from \$20.67 to \$35. Yet despite all these compromises, the competitive economy has still given us a higher standard of living. It will do the same in the years ahead if all of us will make every effort to get the best possible compromise to restore the force of competition.

As a matter of fact, wherever in the world the power of competition is allowed to function, it results in higher living standards. If I could take you with me to Japan, to Hong Kong, to Thailand, and to the Malayan Peninsula, I would be showing you countries in which private enterprise is the basic factor—and these are all growing areas. In contrast, if I took you to the slow-growing areas, I'd be taking you to India, into Indonesia, and into Burma; areas in which government control and government operations are playing the dominant role. In brief, wherever you go in this world, a competitive system, even though under restraint, is still doing the best job. A competitive economy does something else: it helps to maintain freedoms which are important to you and me. The history of this world makes it clear that when people lose the right to select their own careers, to buy and sell in competitive markets, they also lose their freedom of speech, of assembly and of religion.

What am I saying to you today? With all the sincerity I can command, really five simple things. I'm saying to you in the first place that 1962, which began on such a note of optimism gave way as the months went by to a feeling of despair as the economy failed to grow as rapidly as you and I know it should. Second, that this is basically because of the slow growth of an economy which, in turn, is related to a gradual fall in the profit margin. Third, I have tried to suggest certain ways in which we could move to restore competition—give our economy the boost that it needs. Fourth, this won't happen at all unless enough people who believe in this kind of an economic system will get out each and every day of their lives and fight and work for the best possible compromises. Finally, I am saying to you, not only will a private economy produce the world's highest standard of living, but it is the only economy devised by man which gives any promise of preserving freedom—freedoms which are important to any people who maintain that among their unalienable rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

#### TRIBUTE TO LEWIS DESCHLER

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to join in the tribute that the House has paid to Lew Deschler on the occasion of his 35th anniversary as the Parliamentarian of the House.



Lew Deschler's highly professional contribution to the House of Representatives, his profound understanding of its workings, and his unfailing assistance to the Speaker and Members on all occasions has merited the deepest respect and appreciation of us all. The knowledge and experience which he constantly imparts to others is an insurance that our free institutions will continue to uphold the principles of a democracy under the rule of law.

I am especially grateful for the advice and help which Lew Deschler has so willingly given me and my staff during my service in this body. I wish him many continued years of service to the House and to our country.

#### BUDGET CUT

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said both on and off the floor of this House requesting that the minority suggest where the proposed budget might be substantially cut. Last Monday I tried to mention a few such instances. Today I would like for the House to have the benefit of an editorial appearing in the March issue of the Kentucky Farm Bureau wherein they requested that \$1 billion be cut from the agriculture budget.

I commend this editorial to the Members of this House and to the members of the Appropriations Committee.

#### A TAX CUT WILL BE JUSTIFIED IF BUDGET IS BALANCED FIRST

On January 17 President Kennedy presented his budget to Congress. The proposed expenditure budget of \$98,802,000 is the largest since 1789. It tops that of World War II spending by \$500 million. And it is \$4,491 million above the current year's estimated level. Even with the tax revisions, it proposes to take more from the people than in any year since 1789, war or peace.

To add to the fiscal confusion and lack of consistency, Secretary of the Treasury Dillon in his appearance before the House Committee on Ways and Means on February 6 said that the administration will almost certainly ask for an increase of the debt limit from \$308 billion to \$320 billion.

Senators, Representatives, and Farm Bureau members across the country have expressed concern about increasing the national debt. Many are very much concerned about a reduction in taxes without a reduction in expenditures.

We all realize that dealing with the Federal budget is becoming increasingly difficult, and complicated. But we believe that Farm Bureau's approach to the problem is a sound and sensible one.

Farm Bureau is recommending a \$11.8 billion reduction in expenditures which would produce a balanced budget and justify the consideration of a tax cut by Congress.

To show good faith and willingness to share in the general appropriations cut, Farm Bureau is recommending a reduction of \$1 billion in the current level of expenditures for the Department of Agriculture and we

believe it can be done if Farm Bureau's farm program is adopted.

Items included in the \$1 billion agriculture reduction include: Elimination of emergency feed grain program—\$800 million. Reduction of export subsidies on cotton—\$62,500,000. Reduction of export subsidies on wheat—\$360 million. Revised estimate of USDA figures for Public Law 480 (foreign trade aid program) based on more realistic estimates—\$177,500,000.

Considering the reduced estimated cost of Farm Bureau cropland retirement program (20 million acres at \$20 per acre for 1964 crop year) the estimated net saving from the budget request for fiscal year 1964 is \$1 billion.

Farm Bureau is not recommending any cuts from the President's budget requests for such programs as Soil Conservation Service, Farmers Home, and REA lending authorization, and others.

Farm Bureau members have established this policy concerning Government spending and tax reduction:

"A high level of Government spending is inflationary even with a balanced budget. We cannot hope to prevent inflation if the Federal Government continually engages in deficit spending.

"The Government must exercise strict economy, eliminate duplication of effort, and promote efficient operations.

"Congress must take effective measures to manage and control Federal expenditures. The practice of authorizing expenditures from public debt transactions as a means of avoiding annual review by the Appropriations Committee should be discontinued.

"The continued growth of the American economy requires a sustained growth in savings and investment. Extreme graduation in income tax rates tends to discourage the incentive to save and invest. Economic growth and private control of the economy cannot be maintained if a continually increasing proportion of the national income is withdrawn from the economy through taxes.

"Tax programs should be designed to maintain our private competitive enterprise system and to bring about a fair and equitable distribution of the tax burden.

"We recognize the need for a substantial downward adjustment in Federal taxes to create a better climate for economic growth; however, the current budget deficit and our mounting national debt make it mandatory that a cut in Federal expenditures accompany any general reduction in taxes. We are opposed to tax cut proposals which would further unbalance the budget and add to our already excessive national debt.

"We recommend, therefore, that the Federal budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963 be reduced at least 10 percent below the current level in order to permit both a reduction in the deficit and a tax cut.

"We recognize that Federal expenditures for agriculture are contributing to the need for high taxes, and, as evidence of our willingness to share in the proposed reduction of Federal spending, we recommend that the budget of the U.S. Department of Agriculture for price support operations and payments be reduced by \$1 billion, effective in fiscal 1964.

"We challenge all other groups who agree that a tax cut is desirable to make specific recommendations to Congress for comparable reductions in expenditures. We believe that the foreign aid program, for example, can be reduced by \$1 billion—and improved in the process.

"We recognize the need for, and strongly favor, an adequate defense program; however, we believe that several billion dollars can be saved without impairing our defense posture by insisting that the military estab-

lishment provide a dollar's worth of defense for each dollar of expenditure."

The time has come we believe for the budget to be balanced. This is basic to sound government. Any plan for tax reduction must be based on this principle.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUDGET

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the bills which were recommended to the Congress by the President and by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to carry into effect the proposals which the President made to put the fiscal affairs of the District of Columbia on a sound permanent basis. I am happy to say that I am joined in the sponsorship of these two bills by several of my colleagues on the Committee on the District of Columbia, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson], the gentlemen from California [Mr. COHELAN and Mr. SISK], the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DIGGS].

Mr. Speaker, on January 18, 1963, for the first time within my memory, a President transmitted to Congress a message accompanying the budget for the District of Columbia. President Kennedy did it because, as he said, the financial problems of the District have become so critical that they present a challenge to the National Government which must be met. While the District faces many problems, the basic one is a need for additional funds for many vital programs.

The existing authorizations for appropriations for the District of Columbia fall short by more than \$33 million in meeting the needs which it must meet next year. These are vital, basic needs. The budget message from the President dramatically illustrated some of them—in the fields of education, of welfare and health, of public safety. We have been for too long unwilling to provide the District with the tools which it needs in education. For example, good teachers, adequate school buildings with adequate textbooks and other materials.

We cannot say that we have done what we can to provide a capital city worthy of the greatest nation on earth when we countenance thousands of children in split sessions, for lack of classroom space; hundreds of children on the waiting list for kindergarten, because of lack of both space and teachers; textbooks which are woefully out of date; to say nothing of inadequate counselors, special classes, and the like.

But what must be realized is that even this inadequate level of support—which is just as bad in the fields of health, welfare, recreation, and others—will further deteriorate unless additional authoriza-

tions are provided. The population of the District has declined, but the population in need of services—the young, school-age group, and the aged, over-65 group—is increasing, and increasing rapidly.

To add to the problem, the Congress was recently compelled to increase wage rates for District employees, as well as all Federal employees. This alone cost the District more than \$13 million.

We could, of course, grapple only with the problem of fiscal 1964. In the President's budget message, however, he proposed what I believe to be a far better solution, and one which will relieve the Congress of the need to consider the adequacy of authorizations for at least the rest of the decade. He proposes, in short, that the Federal payment to the District be made equitable by a formula which would authorize the appropriation of just what the Federal Government would pay in District taxes if it were a taxable business rather than a government. Under such a formula, while the overwhelming proportion of the funds for the District would continue to be derived from the businesses and individuals who now pay taxes to the District, the District's biggest "business," its biggest landholder and employer, would contribute its equitable share.

The President's proposed solution to the District's financial problems also included additional, and in some cases higher local taxes, to produce \$11 or \$12 million annually. The Commissioners, after a hearing, have proposed and presented a tax package to accomplish this part of the solution. This package is included in the bills introduced today. It is wholly appropriate that the taxpayers of the District contribute a portion of the additional funds which the District so sorely needs.

Finally, the President proposes an increase in the authority of the District to borrow money for capital improvements for schools, health centers, libraries, firehouses, and all the rest except highways and sewers, which are separately funded. Again, rather than authorization to meet only immediate needs, the budget message proposes a long-range solution—that the limit on borrowing be, as it is in most States, a percentage of the taxable property in the District reflecting the District's ability to repay.

The present authorization of \$75 million has been committed. The bills which we have introduced would increase the figure to 6 percent of the tax base, or about \$225 million. Unless the District is to stop, almost entirely, its capital works program, this additional borrowing authority is essential.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has the opportunity to redeem some of the inadequacies which blight many parts of our Capital. We do not cure them with money alone, but neither can we cure them without it.

The Appropriations Committees in both this House and the Senate will insure that the funds which the Congress

authorizes will be spent properly, and in the most effective way.

I believe the President has presented this Congress with an opportunity, as well as a challenge. I sincerely hope that the proposals which he has presented will be given the fullest consideration by the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### PROTECTION OF NATION'S ANTHRACITE COAL RESOURCES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I reintroduced my bill which has the twin purpose of protecting the Nation's vital anthracite coal resources and preventing pollution of Pennsylvania streams.

Specifically, this measure would further permit the use of Federal and State of Pennsylvania funds authorized under the Federal Mine Dewatering Act of 1955, which I sponsored, for a percentage of the cost of the operation and maintenance of pumps in mines.

This proposed bill is a companion measure to the act authorized in last year's Congress which provided for the control and drainage of water in the anthracite coal formations by sealing and filling abandoned coal mines.

No new appropriations are requested of Congress in the bill I have introduced today. Both this bill and the one enacted last year are intended to implement the Federal Mine Dewatering Act of 1955, also known as the Mine Drainage Act, for which appropriations have already been made.

Under the 1955 act, the Federal Government appropriated \$8.5 million, which was equally matched by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, for the purchase and installation of pumps and other necessary machinery for the pumping of water from the mines.

Mr. Speaker, because of the sharp decline in the anthracite industry, and particularly because of the disastrous floods of 1959 which broke into many of the mine operations, a great many anthracite mines have been abandoned. As a result, there is no one to operate and maintain the pumps in these abandoned mines, and the overflow endangers operating mines.

At the time the Mine Sealing Act was passed last year there was \$10 million left in the fund, of which half, of course, were Federal funds. Last year's legislation reserved \$1.5 million for water pumping and a Commonwealth of Pennsylvania companion measure reserved \$2 million of State funds for the same purpose.

In addition to those interested in protecting this vital national resource, the sportsmen and conservationists of Pennsylvania should welcome this legislation

as a further protection against acid water pollution of Pennsylvania streams.

The operating anthracite coal companies are presently pumping water from their mines under controlled conditions imposed by the State health department. Unless they are continuously pumped out, the water levels would eventually reach the point where the overflow would seep into the rivers and streams downstate with wholesale acid water pollution.

Mr. Speaker, the anthracite coal industry cannot bear the full costs of water pumping caused by conditions in abandoned mines beyond their control and still be able to sell coal at prices which will keep them in business.

Unless steps such as called for in this legislation are taken we can drive the remaining anthracite industry out of business. If that happens, the uncontrolled acid water seepage will cause a water pollution problem in Pennsylvania streams the likes of which have never been seen before.

#### COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight Friday night to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. THOMPSON of Texas), leave of absence was granted to Mr. TEAGUE of Texas for Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, March 6, 7, and 8, on account of illness.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 13. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land situated in the State of Arkansas to the city of Fayetteville, Ark.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 345. An act to provide for the approval of a payment in lieu of taxes to be made for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, by the Hawaii Housing Authority to the city and county of Honolulu; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 284. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.



## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FASCELL, for 20 minutes, today.  
Mr. MACGREGOR, for 15 minutes, today.  
Mr. BOW, for 15 minutes, today.  
Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, for 30 minutes tomorrow, March 7, 1963.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, for 10 minutes, today and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. HECHLER, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow, Thursday, March 7, 1963.

Mr. HEMPHILL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 60 minutes, on March 7, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PELLY.  
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SIBAL.  
Mr. HOSMER.  
Mr. HALL.  
Mr. SCHWENGEL.  
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ST. ONGE in two instances.  
Mr. MULTER.  
Mr. BURKHALTER.  
Mr. POOL.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 7, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

512. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting drafts of two proposed bills as follows: (1) "A bill to exempt certain carriers from minimum rate regulation in the transportation of bulk commodities, agricultural and fishery products, and passengers, and for other purposes"; and (2) "A bill to provide for strengthening and improving the national transportation system, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

513. A letter from the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Disability Insurance Trust Funds, transmitting the 23d Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, pursuant to section 201(c) of the Social Security Act, as amended (H. Doc. No. 80); to the Commit-

tee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

514. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, relative to reporting a violation of an overobligation of the amount permitted by agency regulations issued pursuant to the following legislation pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 665 (1)(2); to the Committee on Appropriations.

515. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the rejection of the low bid on procurement of AN/GRC-19 radio sets by the U.S. Army Electronics Materiel Agency, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

516. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for inspection, maintenance and repair of fixed equipment in Federal buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

517. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend subsection 506(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, regarding certification of facts based upon transferred records"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

518. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act redefining the units and establishing the standards of electrical and photometric measurements to provide that the candela shall be the unit of luminous intensity"; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

519. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the 49th Annual Report of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the year 1962, pursuant to section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 228. Resolution to provide funds for the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 179; with an amendment (Rept. No. 58). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 2438. A bill to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 59). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 225. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to employ two additional employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 60). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 254. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred pursuant to House Resolution 103; without amendment (Rept. No. 61). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 2440. A bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 62).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 200. A bill to repeal chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 63). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 211. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to children and parents of deceased veterans; without amendment (Rept. No. 64). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 220. A bill to amend section 704 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the conversion or exchange of policies of national service life insurance to a new modified life plan; without amendment (Rept. No. 65). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 228. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of directors and chiefs of staff of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers; with amendment (Rept. No. 66). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 242. A bill to amend section 1820 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of indebtedness to the United States in certain cases arising out of default on loans guaranteed or made by the Veterans' Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 67). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 243. A bill to amend section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize payment of statutory awards for each anatomical loss or loss of use specified therein; without amendment (Rept. No. 68). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 248. A bill to amend section 801 of title 38, United States Code, to provide assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing for certain blind veterans who have suffered the loss or loss of use of a lower extremity; without amendment (Rept. No. 69). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 249. A bill to amend section 632 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for an extension of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans; with amendment (Rept. No. 70). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1048. A bill providing for the design of the flag of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 71). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2837. A bill to amend further section 11 of the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. 311); without amendment (Rept. No. 72). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the

Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4374. A bill to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America; without amendment (Rept. No. 57). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 4511. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to permit the administration of medical assistance for the aged under an approved State plan by or under the supervision of a State agency separate from the State agency administering the rest of the plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.R. 4512. A bill to repeal section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 4513. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that under certain conditions the profit from the sale of a home shall not be considered as income; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROMWELL:

H.R. 4514. A bill to authorize wartime benefits under certain circumstances for peacetime veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 4515. A bill to amend section 602 of title 18, United States Code, to make it a crime for certain persons, for political purposes, to divulge information relating to lists or names of persons employed by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 4516. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, so as to make its provisions applicable to agriculture; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4517. A bill to provide financial assistance to the States to improve educational opportunities for migrant agricultural employees and their children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4518. A bill to amend the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Labor to develop and maintain improved, voluntary methods of recruiting, training, transporting, and distributing agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4519. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Council to be known as the "National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4520. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend the child labor provisions thereof to certain children employed in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4521. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, 1938, as amended, to provide for minimum wages for certain persons employed in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4522. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to establish a program to assist farmers in providing adequate sanitation facilities for migratory farm laborers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4523. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to assist States in providing

for day-care services for children of migrant agricultural workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 4524. A bill to provide for recognition of Federal employee unions and to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4525. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, with respect to the contributions made by Government toward health benefit protection for employees and annuitants and members of their families; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4526. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 4527. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the Battle of Bushy Run; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 4528. A bill to revitalize the cotton growing and cotton manufacturing industry and to reduce Federal expenditures for price support operations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4529. A bill to revitalize the cotton growing and cotton manufacturing industry and to reduce Government expenditures for price support and other subsidy operations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4530. A bill granting to persons in the classified (competitive) civil service the right to a hearing before removal or suspension, and the right to a judicial review of a removal or suspension; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 4531. A bill to amend the act of July 15, 1955, relating to the conservation of anthracite coal resources, to remove certain restrictions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 4532. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 4533. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to prohibit the prescribing or administering of certain prescription drugs without first informing the patient, or his representatives, that death could result from the use of such drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 4534. A bill to authorize mortgage insurance and loans to help finance the cost of constructing and equipping facilities for the group practice of medicine and dentistry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HORAN (by request):

H.R. 4535. A bill to authorize a per capita distribution of \$350 from funds arising from judgments in favor of any of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H.R. 4536. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 4537. A bill to assist the several States in establishing hospital facilities and programs of posthospital aftercare for the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4538. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches, work measurement programs, or other performance standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4539. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition paid by him for the education of a dependent child at an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 4540. A bill to provide for reimbursement of toll charges necessarily incurred by Federal jurors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 4541. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 4542. A bill to prohibit the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 4543. A bill to increase to 15 percent the night differential of postal field service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4544. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a mid-decade census of population, unemployment, and housing in 1965 and every 10 years thereafter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 4545. A bill to amend section 356 of title 38, United States Code, to provide a permanent rating of 50 percent disability for veterans who have suffered from active tuberculosis for 10 or more years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.R. 4546. A bill to amend section 2(d) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit the payment of annuities to retired railroad workers whether or not they render service to the last person (other than a railroad) by whom employed; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 4547. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of certain contributions to nonprofit medical research organizations and to provide exemptions from certain excise taxes for such organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 4548. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 4549. A bill to amend section 4103 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the appointment of the Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 4550. A bill to establish in the Department of the Interior a Gold Procurement and Sales Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 4551. A bill to amend section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code with respect to the mailing of obscene matter, and



for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4552. A bill to establish a program for the Government purchase and resale of domestically produced, newly mined processed mica and mica ore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 4553. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 4554. A bill to permit certain employees of a State or political subdivision thereof to elect coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system, as self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4555. A bill to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87-346, relating to dual rate contracts; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4556. A bill to amend section 883 of title 46, United States Code; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 4557. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire through exchange the Great Falls property in the State of Virginia for administration in connection with the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 4558. A bill to provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 4559. A bill to amend section 104 (b) (3) of title 23, United States Code, relating to the apportionment of funds for extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary systems within urban areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 4560. A bill to amend chapter 2 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the period within which certain ministers, members of religious orders, and Christian Science practitioners may elect coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 4561. A bill to improve intergovernmental relations and Government operations by assisting the States to carry out on a continuing basis inservice training programs for officers and employees of State and local governments with a view to increasing efficiency and economy in the operations of State and local governments, including the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the possessions of the United States, and encouraging the highest standards of performance in the transaction of the public business; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 4562. A bill to provide for a program of weather modification to be carried out by the Secretary of the Interior, acting in cooperation with the National Science Foundation, to increase substantially the annual average of usable supply of water available in the Colorado River drainage basin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KNOX:

H.R. 4563. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4564. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to authorize payment of

old-age insurance benefits to all individuals who have attained age 70; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4565. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit for amounts paid for tuition or fees to institutions of higher education or for occupational training or retraining, to allow a credit for taxes paid for public education, and to exempt from income tax certain scholarships, fellowships, and student assistantships; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 4566. A bill to appropriate funds to initiate preconstruction planning of improvements to Wilmington Harbor, N.C.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 4567. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code (Copyrights), to permit a further extension of copyrights for a 15-year period and to provide that one-half of the royalties received during that period shall be used to assist promising young composers and authors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 4568. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 4569. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption of \$1,000 for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is a student at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 4570. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 4571. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to protect the navigable waters of the United States from further pollution by requiring that synthetic petroleum-based detergents manufactured in the United States or imported into the United States comply with certain standards of decomposability; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 4572. A bill to establish penalties for the operation of a motor vehicle between States by a person while his motor vehicle operator's license is suspended or revoked; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 4573. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4574. A bill to provide for the desegregation of public schools, with all deliberate speed, including nationwide first-step compliance by 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4575. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 4576. A bill to establish a new program of loans to be made from a revolving fund by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to assist in the provision and rehabilitation of housing for middle-income families; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4577. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to prohibit the construction of luxury housing in the redevelopment of urban renewal areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4578. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to require the establishment of more effective procedures for the relocation of individuals, families, and busi-

ness concerns from the area of urban renewal projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4579. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide more adequate relocation payments for individuals, families, and business concerns displaced from urban renewal areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4580. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide that individuals, families, and business concerns displaced by an urban renewal project shall have a priority of opportunity to relocate in the project area after its redevelopment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4581. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize Federal participation in the cost of acquiring air rights as a part of an urban renewal project, and to prohibit luxury housing in the redevelopment of urban renewal areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4582. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to permit occupants of dwelling units in low-rent public housing projects to purchase such units; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4583. A bill to amend title II of the National Housing Act to provide Federal Housing Administration mortgage insurance for individuals purchasing dwelling units in cooperative housing projects in the same way that such insurance is provided for individuals purchasing other single-family residences; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4584. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to provide that a tenant in a low-rent public housing project may not be evicted therefrom without a public hearing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4585. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require the owner of an apartment building or other multifamily structure to establish and utilize a repair, replacement, and maintenance reserve as a condition of the allowance of a depreciation deduction with respect to such structure; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4586. A bill to provide that no Federal financial or other assistance may be extended to any educational institution which discriminates against students or prospective students on account of race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4587. A bill to provide for recognition of Federal employee unions and to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 4588. A bill to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Mojave B Aerial Gunnery Range, San Bernardino County, Calif., for defense purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOR WILSON:

H.R. 4589. A bill to provide that in determining the amount of retired pay, retirement pay, or retainer pay payable to any enlisted man, all service shall be counted which would have been counted for the same purposes if he were a commissioned officer; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4590. A bill to strengthen the criminal penalties for the mailing, importing, or transporting of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4591. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords, with re-

sulting complete aphonia; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 4592. A bill to provide for increased Federal Government participation in meeting the costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City and to authorize Federal loans to the District of Columbia for capital improvement programs; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H.R. 4593. A bill to provide for increased Federal Government participation in meeting the costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City and to authorize Federal loans to the District of Columbia for capital improvement programs; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 4594. A bill to provide for increased Federal Government participation in meeting the costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City and to authorize Federal loans to the District of Columbia for capital improvement programs; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.R. 4595. A bill to provide for increased Federal Government participation in meeting the costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City and to authorize Federal loans to the District of Columbia for capital improvement programs; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 4596. A bill to provide for increased Federal Government participation in meeting the costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City and to authorize Federal loans to the District of Columbia for capital improvement programs; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 4597. A bill to provide for increased Federal Government participation in meeting the costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City and to authorize Federal loans to the District of Columbia for capital improvement programs; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 4598. A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H.R. 4599. A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 4600. A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.R. 4601. A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 4602. A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 4603. A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.J. Res. 305. Joint resolution to temporarily suspend the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve consolidations, unifications, or acquisitions of control of railroad properties; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.J. Res. 306. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the

United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCINTIRE:

H.J. Res. 307. Joint resolution requesting and authorizing the President to impose an immediate 6 percent emergency quota on all imports of softwood lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.J. Res. 308. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.J. Res. 309. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make a study to determine the best means of providing an expanded college education program at Howard University by agreement with the Board of Trustees of Howard University; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.J. Res. 310. Joint resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of "How Our Laws Are Made" as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution to favor the establishment of an international living museum; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. Res. 279. Resolution authorizing a Captive Nations Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. Res. 280. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H. Res. 281. Resolution to amend the rules of the House by creating a separate standing Committee on Labor; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H. Res. 282. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct an investigation and study of the operation of the slum clearance and urban renewal program in New York City and the other major cities of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H. Res. 283. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 284. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the use of the Panama Canal by vessels engaged in trade with Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. LIBONATTI:

Memorial of the 73d General Assembly of the State of Illinois, urging the adoption and enactment of appropriate measures to relieve the financial burdens of States and local governments as a result of interstate residential changes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER:

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States rela-

tive to a commemorative stamp honoring Hollywood's entertainment industry; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 4604. A bill for the relief of certain retired officers of the U.S. Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 4605. A bill for the relief of Carlota Figueira Miguens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN (by request):

H.R. 4606. A bill for the relief of Mercedes De Toffoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 4607. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan C. Jacobe, and their four children, Angela Jacobe, Teresita Jacobe, Leo Jacobe and Ramon Jacobe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 4608. A bill for the relief of Gertrude P. Splaine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 4609. A bill for the relief of Hisae Otsu Coleman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 4610. A bill for the relief of Juanita Alice Lind; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 4611. A bill for the relief of Sister Rosaria Carlinio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4612. A bill for the relief of Sister Ornella Longo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4613. A bill for the relief of Sister Corrada Amoroso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 4614. A bill for the relief of Cynthia L. Morrison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 4615. A bill for the relief of Inez Humphreys Dixon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 4616. A bill for the relief of Yu Bing Chuck, Yu Lai Jing, Yu Lai Chun, and Yu Bing Cheong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 4617. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carole Ann Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4618. A bill for the relief of Rene Sportes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

61. By Mr. SCHENCK: Petition of Paul R. Deger and 184 others to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

62. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Z. Michael Szaz, Queens County Young Republican Association, Richmond Hill, N.Y. relative to recommending that the U.S. Government shall, by extending a short time limit, demand from the Cuban and Soviet Governments that a ground and air inspection of missile and air bases be permitted under the supervision of the Organization of American States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.